JUN 1 2 1953

Presented to
Bonebrake
Theological Seminary
Library
Dayton, Ohio

by
GARRETT
BIBLICAL INSTITUTE

CHRIST AND MODERN EDUCATION

CHRIST AND MODERN EDUCATION

BY

CHARLES E. RAVEN, D.D.

CANON OF LIVERPOOL AND CHAPLAIN TO THE KING

LIBRARY OF
Bexley Hall Theological Seminary
BV
1471
R293
1928
29369

NEW YORK
HENRY HOLT AND COMPANY

Printed in Great Britain

To

MY COLLEAGUES

AT THE JERUSALEM COUNCIL

JUN 24 1953

CONTENTS

		PAGE
	Preface	9
I.	Introductory: The Significance of the Jerusalem Council . . .	17
II.	The Failure of our Religious Education	35
III.	The Place of Religion in Education .	53
IV.	The Content of Religious Education .	85
V.	The Method of Religious Education .	119
	A. The Elements Involved . .	121
	B. The Teaching-Method of Jesus in its Earlier Stages . . .	139
	C. The Application of His Method to Pre-adolescent Education .	155
	D. The Teaching-Method of Jesus in its Later Phases and its Application in Education . .	174
VI.	The Scope of Religious Education .	199

PREFACE

This book owes its existence, and much of its contents, to the meeting of the International Missionary Council at Jerusalem. The invitation to attend it and to take part in its consideration of religious education gave me the opportunity to put into shape a study of the teaching-method of Jesus Christ which had been for many years in my mind, and to test my results by consultation with a group of experienced educationalists. The interest with which they received a brief statement of my conclusions has encouraged me to set them out at greater length and for a larger public.

So far as the psychology of education is concerned this book makes no claim to independence of outlook. It is based upon material derived from recognised experts

like Professors Kilpatrick and Dewey, Professor Nunn and Dr. Maxwell Garnett, and upon such knowledge of the facts of growth and of tuition as twenty years of work as a teacher have supplied. A rude reviewer has recently said of me that I "possess a great faculty of uttering platitudes with an air of originality." The conclusions of modern pedagogics are hardly yet platitudes: but if in citing them I have refrained from footnotes and quotations, I have not done so in order to suggest that my work is original, but simply to avoid overloading a book intended for the general reader. For this part of it I am especially indebted to the writers already mentioned, to Mr. J. H. Oldham, Professor Weigle and Professor Hocking, and other colleagues at the Jerusalem Council, and especially to Canon Garfield Williams.

The larger part of the book is concerned with an attempt to show that the teaching

given by Jesus not only fulfils the requirements laid down by the wisest educationalists and psychologists of to-day, but supplies clear and practical guidance as to the aim and scope, the method, the technique, and the grading of religious education. As such it deserves the closest attention from teachers and from the Church —not least because it indicates the necessity of an almost revolutionary change in our traditional mode of presenting Christianity to our pupils. Indeed, so great is the contrast between Christ's way and the way still normally adopted by parents, clergy, and teachers that, if my interpretation of His work be in any degree correct, there would seem to be little need to seek further causes for the admitted failure of institutional religion. No one can study the actual results of our present religious education—results sufficiently demonstrated in Mr. Hendy Cock's recent book, *The Religious Psychology of the Child*—without

being appalled by the evidence of its general inadequacy. At a time when every thoughtful person realises the importance of religion for education, and when very many would desire to see education based upon Christianity, Christians, despite the devotion of very many thousands of teachers and the courageous efforts of a handful of pioneers, cannot point except with apologies to the fruits of their labours. If it be true that our method is wholly unlike that of Jesus, we shall hardly be surprised at our lack of success. Where modern educational theory and the example of our Lord coincide, we may surely recognise an imperative call to drastic and speedy reform.

It remains for me to add a brief note as to the preliminary considerations which lie behind my sketch of the teaching-method of Jesus. To enter into a critical study of the documents would be out of place: but for the sake of clearness it

should be stated that the treatment is based upon the records of the Galilean ministry, that it accepts the general outline supplied by St. Mark's Gospel, and that it does not include a survey of the aspect of our Lord's life described by the Fourth Evangelist. I believe that the stages in the training of the disciples here set out are plainly indicated to a careful student of the Synoptists, that we have in them, and especially in St. Mark, a sequence of events which may be accepted as historical, and that St. John, though I regard his Gospel as a true likeness of Jesus, does not deal with the progressive unfolding of His work, but with an interpretation of the character revealed by that work to the Beloved Disciple. Put otherwise, I believe that Jesus, intimately known, was what St. John describes, but that the Evangelist depicts Him without regard to development in chosen scenes laid chiefly in Jerusalem and coloured

by a lifetime of memory. The Synoptists seem to me to supply a biographical or, if you will, a cinematographic record: the Fourth Evangelist an artist's portrait. Moreover, the former give us a clue as to the stages by which the final interpretation was made possible. As such, for our purpose their Gospels are our guide.

It is hardly necessary to add that for help in the study of the New Testament I am indebted to a great number of teachers and writers, or that the present survey could be defended by reference to very many scholars. Its general outline would, I believe, be endorsed by the majority of theologians in this country.

Of the importance of the theme, however unworthy the present discussion of it, there can be little doubt. The Council at Jerusalem has put its convictions on record, stating at the close of its report on Religious Education: "The new concept of education, wrought out by a multitude

of students labouring in many fields, constitutes, as we believe, a signal means and opportunity for the extension of God's Kingdom. As such we would accept it for ourselves and commit it to the Church, recognising that if we are to use it rightly it must be by the example and in the fellowship of Him who, in bringing many sons unto glory, was made perfect by suffering, Him who in this holy place Himself learned obedience by the things that He suffered."

C. E. R.

LIVERPOOL, *Sept.* 1928.

THE SIGNIFICANCE OF THE JERUSALEM COUNCIL

Be

I

THE SIGNIFICANCE OF THE JERUSALEM COUNCIL

Ever since the death of a comparatively obscure archduke at Sarajevo it has been a truism that the world has been made one. Politicians, industrialists, travellers, missionaries may have realised before 1914 that the barriers of geography were disappearing and that a new era of international, and in some respects standardised, civilisation was opening. They saw the spread of nationalist and democratic ideas, of machinery and its factories, of Western modes of thought and habit, and the consequent undermining of racial cults and tribal customs. But it needed the shock of a world-wide war to bring home to us all the interdependence of one people

upon another. We learned from our common sufferings what economic conditions had failed to teach us—that every nation was intimately involved in the destinies of all the others, that no one, however remote, could remain uninfluenced by the general life of mankind, and that, if we were to understand conditions in our own lands or plan wisely for our own future, we must not confine our attention to domestic affairs or to the peoples of our own colour or speech.

The effect of this discovery upon Christians has been readily seen in the events of the past ten years. Everywhere preachers and writers were quick to recognise the opportunity thus offered for evangelism. It was freely stated that at last the conditions made possible, nay, from the Christian standpoint compelled, the fulfilment in this generation of our Lord's command to go and teach all nations ; that only on the basis of a common Christianity could the

new civilisation escape chaos and find a foundation for universal brotherhood ; and that, examined in detail, the factors which enabled the missionary enterprise of St. Paul, peace and ordered government, easy transport, a generally understood language, and settlements of fellow-nationals to serve as a " jumping-off " ground, were now being repeated on a world-wide scale. A fresh stimulus was given to evangelistic effort ; a new sense of responsibility coloured the work of the home Churches ; a note of romance and adventure returned to the pulpit and the platform.

With it came inevitably a demand for reunion and for immediate co-operation between the denominations. Before a programme of such scope and urgency the wastage of resources due to sectional action, the overlappings and conflicts, were felt to be intolerable. Moreover, if Christianity was to commend itself as the source of true brotherhood, it could not afford to deny

that brotherhood abroad by disunion at home. World conferences, Stockholm, Lausanne, Jerusalem, were the natural expression of the consciousness of unity, the Church's response to the coming of internationalism. The preparation for these great gatherings, influencing multitudes whose religion had hitherto been almost parochial in its outlook, emphasised both the novelty and the gravity of the situation ; those who took part in it could not but share a vision of the grandeur of their calling, a vision which, if it sometimes filled them with impatience and even with despair of institutional religion, yet marked a change of temper more profound than they could know. " We are members one of another " is a saying that has gained in these days a universal familiarity. If at present most of us are more conscious of our failures, of the slowness of progress and the obstacles in our path than of our hope, this is in itself a sign that the day of

complacent isolation and acquiescence in disunion is over.

Nevertheless, it is probably true to say that until very lately the belief that the world is one has been interpreted superficially. We have meant by it that the several races were becoming inevitably interdependent, that ideas, like fashions and commodities, were being exported to all quarters, that Western culture, and even Western religion, had already secured a position of universal dominance. As our new conviction affected our missionary work, it produced rather a desire to speed up the work of handing on the Gospel than a sense that the task of all Christians everywhere was the same. The "sending Churches" saw themselves called to fresh effort lest the emissaries of commerce and of Western materialism should possess the field before them. They saw themselves as trustees of Christianity, charged to carry it to those whose ethnic faiths were

being undermined and whose second state, if Christians failed in their duty, might well be worse than the first. That Africa might be captured by Mohammedanism, that China might adopt a materialistic industrialism, that India might take Swaraj as its creed, rejecting Christ from prejudice against His white envoys, these were their anxieties. If they were aware of the shortcomings of their own Christianity, it hardly occurred to them to question the difference between Christian and non-Christian lands, or to ask whether in actual fact their position entitled them to maintain so obvious a contrast. Here and there a voice might insist upon the policy of the one front, and might strive to show that in Europe and America the situation was fundamentally the same as in " heathen " countries. But for the vast majority it was sufficient reply to point to the centuries during which the Church had influenced the white races, and to insist that,

even if their present plight was often deplorable, their atmosphere was permeated with an unescapable Christianity. The world was one : yet, as in a map of the British Empire, we could still colour certain sections of it with the royal purple of the Christ.

To state the matter so is to suggest that the older Churches were guilty of a certain patronage of outlook, that their missionary work had something in common with imperialism. The suggestion, if left unmodified, would be unjust. Never had there been so great a wave of self-examination, of penitence, of alarm at their own state. They were ready to confess that, in spite of their heritage and tradition, their influence was small, their efforts inadequate, their vision defective, their failings indisputable. Along with renewed missionary activity must go a radical policy of reform at home, a strenuous attempt to understand and apply the implications of the faith, a resolute

endeavour to evangelise their fellow-countrymen. A hostile critic might well have urged that, like the priests of Baal, they were claiming a universal hearing while gashing themselves with knives and lances in a frenzy of fear because in the place where they should have been supreme there was no response to their prayers. The situation was indeed open to such comment. In Europe and America, while many were asserting the universality of Christ, and the uniqueness of the opportunity to baptise all nations, others with a repentance not far from pessimism were facing the evidence of empty churches, starved ministries, Mammon-ridden congregations, and the revolt of the younger generation against organised religion. It needed the experience of the Jerusalem Council to explain the contrast, to reveal the true situation, and, if we are quick to accept its conclusions, to set us on the way to truer and saner action.

"The world has become one": Jerusalem, 1928, demonstrated to the Church a deeper significance in those words, and marked a complete revaluation of our understanding of them.

With the preparation for the Conference and the circulation of the preliminary papers one supreme fact became increasingly plain. The ablest students of missionary work obviously realised that a new epoch in that work had begun. Hitherto the distinction between home and foreign fields, between Christian and non-Christian countries, had been legitimate: their problems had been different; their needs called for special and easily separable methods. If the familiar picture of the lonely white man, with his bible or crucifix, confronting a crowd of hostile or interested pagans was no longer an appropriate symbol of missionary work, at least the presentation of the Gospel—the points to be emphasised, the objections to be met,

the technique to be employed—must in the mission field demand qualities in the evangelist for which at home he would have no scope; and, conversely, work among white races needed qualifications and methods totally inappropriate elsewhere. As we studied the literature of the Missionary Council, it became evident that even this phase had passed away. Over-and over again, both in their accounts of existing conditions and explicitly by direct appeal, we were warned that the Church was facing not many issues but one, and that issue the same in every land. Everywhere the enemy was not so much rival faiths or pagan cults as the bewilderment caused by changed economic and social conditions, the materialism fostered by our control of physical resources, by the stress of existence, by new objects of interest and pleasure, by temptations which, if long known in the older countries, were now almost universal. Secular

civilisation, so it might be called, had spread throughout the continents: its products in Asia or Africa were like those with which Europe had long been familiar. Our foe abroad was the same as our foe at home. If we of the West had longer experience of his power, he was among us more deeply entrenched. Christians, world over, were engaged not only in a single campaign, but in a similar one. The conditions of our warfare were identical whatever the hue of our complexions. Racial antipathies, national ambitions, industrial exploitations, over-population, materialism, worldliness, and indifference —these were universal; and behind them lay "the corruption of man's heart"— pride and greed, jealousy and hatred, lust and sloth, and the failure of Christians to fulfil and proclaim and interpret their faith.

From the documents the impression was manifest: it was intensified and fixed at the meetings. No-one could listen to

Dr. Datta's denunciation of Britain, or Principal Hope's more restrained but not less terrible indictment of the United States, and feel that the West had any grounds for its sense of superiority. As we heard at first hand the evidence of our failure, as we heard with it the call to further effort, the same message, whether in words of gratitude or of criticism, was reiterated : we knew that we at home were experiencing in ourselves and in our countries the same difficulties, the same defeats, the same discoveries as our fellows in India and China, in Uganda or Brazil or the Philippines. They were one with us in their needs, in their endeavours, in their hopes and fears, for they were confronted with the same issues and relied upon the same resources. All alike we were workers in one mission field : in the country district, in the industrial city, in the school or university, East and West were doing the same work and in the same way.

Ought we to have felt humiliated, when we recognised in the fears and hopes of Dr. Yui or the evangelistic methods of Dr. Mackay exactly the same features which we had thought peculiar to the older Churches? It was for some of us something of a surprise: we were slow to believe that the godlessness of our own lands could be so like that of hardly evangelised strangers. Yet the evidence could not be gainsaid. Mr. Chatterji of Bengal and his story of the child who in its Scripture hour would say that the wisest of men was Solomon, and in the next period Solon; President Watson and the street-walker of Cairo, who in her mission school had learnt English, but not Christianity; Dr. Wallace and the report on Chinese education that religion was taught far worse than any other subject—these were telling us what could be paralleled a hundred times from our own home-lands. And when we examined the causes of the

resemblances we discovered their essential identity. We had all fallen short, and fallen short for the same reasons and against the same obstacles.

If there was a passing sense of humiliation, there was also the inspiration of a deepened brotherhood and an added stimulus to go back and do our best. Those who had been weighed down by a fear that their work was local and their difficulties peculiar, could not but take courage to discover that all the world was in the same strait. Those who had leaned upon the West and been disappointed in the quality of its support, felt that they were no longer pupils, but partners. Those who had been working in home fields and inclined to resent the dullness of their task, realised that they too were collaborators in the solution of world-wide problems. Experiments, wherever made, would apply far beyond their immediate sphere ; knowledge hardly gained, whether

in a village school in West Africa or a university in the Middle West, was available for all; to fail in Birmingham was as much a failure in missionary work as to fail in Bombay; Europe had a longer experience, and might forewarn the newer fields; Asia was less hampered by tradition, and could explore new methods and send them back to older Churches. All the world was one.

And if one in its warfare, one also in its hope and strength—one in Christ. It hardly needed the glowing words of the report on the Christian message to convince us that "whate'er our name or sign" our faith was the same, if our task was universal. How to Christianise—where we had so often only Europeanised or Americanised; how to present Christ in such fashion as to overcome prejudice and break down indifference and liberate from materialism; how to train up in all lands a generation of disciples; how to

preserve body and soul and spirit entire and bring them to the measure of His stature. Some of us had gone to Jerusalem expecting that for long sessions we should be inactive while experts discussed religions with which we had small contact and situations irrelevant to our own. If so, we were proved mistaken. From first to last the Conference faced one issue, and sought for one solution : the issue was the world-wide prevalence of a definite type of malady ; the solution was a right method in ministering the power of Jesus Christ for the healing of the nations.

THE FAILURE OF OUR RELIGIOUS EDUCATION

II

THE FAILURE OF OUR RELIGIOUS EDUCATION

A UNIVERSAL disease and a universal remedy—such a claim might be true of evangelism, of mission-preaching and the task of making converts : could it be true of religious education ? Take a bush-school in the Congo, or a missionary college in Madras or Hankow, and compare the scope of their work with that of the educational institutions of Europe or America. Surely, with the difference in the pupils, there will be no possible similarity in the difficulties to be overcome or the technique to be employed ; surely here, if anywhere, the influence of centuries of Christianity will make itself felt ; surely the children of countries nominally Christian

start on a wholly different level from those whose whole environment is redolent of heathenism. The Jews of St. Paul's day, and apparently certain pillars of the Christian Church with them, were convinced that it was so—that Gentiles could not dispense with the discipline of the religion from which had sprung the Christ, that the ages of preparation must count for something of privilege and added worth. They might, by their leaders and even by their character, have failed to realise their advantages : they could not, despite such failure, allow that their present state was no better than that of the " lesser breeds without the Law." If there is something of racial pride in their attitude, there is also strong argument on their side. It was St. Paul's first business to show that neither Jew nor Greek had cause for complacency : both were under the same condemnation ; both had failed, and for the same reasons ; for both had possessed

and had rejected evidence that testified of God.

It was, of course, apparent long before the Jerusalem Conference that religious education had not been succeeding in its objects. If the missionary was distressed that so few of his pupils could be brought to baptism and definite acceptance of Christianity, his perplexity was shared to the full by teachers and church-members at home. The absence of young people in the congregations, the shortage of recruits for churchwork, the leakage between the Sunday School and church membership, the drift from church-going in the colleges, the evidence of ignorance and irreligion in the armies—these were all proof that something was seriously wrong with our teaching of the faith. Each of us in our own experience can recall many meetings and discussions in which our failure was confessed; and if at first we spoke of it with hesitation, wishing neither to criticise devoted

workers nor to reveal our own dismay, the true situation was becoming too obvious for concealment. Gradually the extent of the danger forced itself upon the consciousness of the Church. In the autumn of 1927 (to quote one instance among hundreds) the Archbishop of Uppsala,[1] who knows the "sending Churches" as intimately as anyone, had warned us that "many educated people in Christendom do not now know the story of the Gospel at all," that "Christianity has in many countries been removed from the obligatory programme of the schools," that in the United States, in Holland, and France, and Britain and elsewhere "one meets cultivated and thinking persons who have never had any religious instruction," and that "a mission is needed also in our own civilisation, since the very future of Christianity is in danger." At a time when the Western nations were looking with

[1] See *Review of the Churches*, Vol. V., pp. 244-8.

intense and wistful hope to the youth of the world, when older people were saying that only the young could repair the ruins of nations bled white in war, when schools and colleges were springing up and being filled everywhere, careful observers could only view the religious outlook with dismay and call us to a "newest mission field created by the heathenism of the younger generation."[1]

The situation thus revealed is sufficiently startling. We had believed, despite the evidence, that it was barely possible in Christian countries for children to grow up without at least the opportunity of Christian teaching; we assumed that those who did not belong to the Church had rejected its appeal, that they knew and disliked it; we had not thought of ourselves as living among multitudes who were simply pagan not from choice, but through ignorance. Or, if we knew, we had not taken our

[1] Rev. C. L. Glenn in *The Spirit of Missions*, March 1928.

knowledge seriously. If the facts are true, then indeed we are a mission field ourselves, and must make sure that we face them and no longer take the Christianity of our people for granted. Christian schools become as much a matter to be striven and sacrificed for here in Europe as in the lands of Hinduism, Confucianism, or Islam.

But we have not summed up the situation when we have realised that many of our fellow-countrymen have had no religious education. If that were all, our duty would be plain: we should merely have to increase the amount of Christian teaching. As it is, our task is less simple. It is not only the amount, but the quality of our teaching that is defective. We ask ourselves why in a Christian land is there this ignorance? Can we avoid some such answers as these? It is because the bulk of our countrymen do not realise the need for religion in education; and this is due

to the failure of Christians to convince their fellows that religion is essential; and this, again, is due to the fact that their own Christian training has been so faulty that it has discredited their witness to religion. Indeed, we must go further still. While it is true that many are unchristian through lack of knowledge, is it not also true that much teaching of Christianity is so poor in content and so mistaken in method as to produce not discipleship, but dislike and rejection and a prejudice against Christ? If we were to be able to enforce the inclusion of Christianity in the curriculum, would not this, unless we reformed our methods of teaching, be likely to defeat its own end? If the children of certain schools learn little or nothing of religion, are they, in fact, in worse case than those who learn something that is imparted without knowledge of the laws of growth, by a technique that has been rejected for every other subject, and with

a content wholly unworthy of Jesus Christ ?

Such questions, asked by multitudes of teachers at home and abroad, have in fact given rise already to a mass of enlightened enquiry and experiment, and in some quarters, particularly among missionaries, to radical and significant reforms. To many teachers the failure of the old ways is obvious : by some of them new ways full of promise have been adopted. But it is not yet true that the Church as a whole has taken the matter seriously or is ready to recognise the extent and causes of its mistakes. If we are to understand the findings of the Jerusalem Council or to appreciate their significance, we must first examine the adequacy of our traditional concept of religious education.

In the first place we may set down the failure to distinguish between instruction and education, and consequently the tendency to accept for Christianity a position

in the curriculum as a single subject on a level, as regards time-allowance and importance, with all the rest. This has arisen partly out of the belief that it was our business as Christian teachers rather to impart information about God than to help our pupils to experience Him, partly out of the assumed contrast between religious and secular subjects, exemplified in the so-called conflict between religion and science, and too often expressing itself in a suggested cleavage between religion and the life of every day. We did not sufficiently maintain that religion enters into every aspect of human activity, that all truth is God's truth, and that no subject in the programme is irrelevant to the Christian educator. We failed to realise that what was wanted was not that science or history should be taught with a special and dogmatic Christian purpose, so much as that pupils and staff alike should understand that these subjects are studied in

order that we may learn the facts about nature and man, and that this knowledge of true facts is in itself religious. At present one could hardly mention any school or university in which the whole curriculum was planned so as to form a unity whose object in all its departments was to foster fullness of life and the development of an integrated and religious character. Too often we have been content to teach Bible stories, the Gospel record, and a brief survey of the earliest Church without seeing to it that by worship and service, as well as by the whole activity of the school in work and play, Christian education, of which instruction is only a part, was achieved. In countries where a State system of secular education is supplemented by religious teaching in Sunday schools and outside the normal lessons, this danger is hard to overcome ; but it is prevalent even in Christian institutions. We are Christians for a period after

breakfast: we then become scientists or historians.

Secondly, even our instruction has too frequently been so presented as to create a false impression of the quality of religion, and later on a rebellion against it. The study of psychology and pedagogics has profoundly modified during the past generation the whole teaching of secular subjects. It is now recognised that the process of learning need not involve boredom and drudgery and subconscious revolt, if the pupil is helped to discover and assimilate knowledge suited to his age and growth. Unhappily, it is still true of many schools that religion is the only subject taught on lines that conflict with sound educational principles. Children are still given Old Testament stories at a time when they have no sense of historical development, and of a kind which represent God as jealous, vindictive, and cruel. They are set to learn by heart texts and catechisms

of which they cannot understand the meaning, and which, therefore, often produce bewilderment or irritation. They hear such emphasis laid on the miracles and divinity of Jesus, and see Him in pictures so false to real life as they know it that He seems just a dweller in fairyland. They are taken to services suitable maybe to adults, but to them meaningless and wearisome, where the only element of relief is the singing of hymns that are often mawkish and morbid, utterly unworthy alike of God and of His little ones.

Add to these two factors the further fact that we who would teach them often fail to live Christianly, that our world is full of examples of the attractiveness of all that Christianity condemns, and that even Christian teachers and pastors do not always escape a professional piety which forgets its religion as soon as the hour for school or church is over, and it will not be

surprising that even those who have what is nominally a religious education grow up alienated rather than attracted.

For no one who is closely acquainted with Western countries can well doubt that there are very many men and women, brought up under Christian instruction, who are far more out of sympathy with the Church than the merely ignorant. It is not enough to say that they have been inoculated with a mild form of religion and rendered immune to any serious attack of it: rather the form in which religion came to them created at first a subconscious and then a conscious antagonism to it. Very many of us nowadays can trace the effects of our early teaching in years of perplexity and pain, when we strove to reconcile mistaken ideas of God and a theology based on deductions and churches out of touch with reality with our desire for worship, our glimmerings of religious experience and our knowledge of the universe and of

mankind. It is this real and deep-seated cleavage between religion and life, rather than its offshoot, the conflict between religion and science, that is our present and imminent danger. And so long as Christians accept art that is tawdry, doctrines that are unintelligible or untrue, and moral standards lower than those of enlightened unbelievers, the danger will increase.

While we believe that in the best types of school the worst days are over, and thankfully recognise that great progress both in the mission fields abroad and in the churches of the West has recently been made, it is our conviction that a vast amount has still to be done, if we are to recover for religion its position at the core of all true education, and are to present Christianity in the form best suited to the needs of its pupils, and the quality of its own genius. As Herr Eberhard told us at the close of his speech at Jerusalem :

"Modern pedagogy in the service of Jesus —that would be a result of our Conference which would bring blessing and help to the home not less than to the foreign work of our Churches and schools."

THE PLACE OF RELIGION IN EDUCATION

III

THE PLACE OF RELIGION IN EDUCATION

THE first business of anyone who recognises the vast potentialities of education and feels that the Church is not yet making full use of them is to study the general aspect of the matter. Words, if they can never more than "half-reveal the soul within," often become so distorted in common use as to convey a wholly false impression. Both religion and education have suffered in this respect; for each is often given a value far narrower than it deserves, so narrow indeed as to destroy its real significance.

So obvious a remark is only justified because, in fact, the very grave difficulties considered in the last chapter arise from

our habit of assigning wrong meanings to our words, and therefore accepting inadequate ideas of our work. If it is true that our present achievement in Christian education is far from satisfactory, if we are depressed at our apparent failure, an examination of the educational ideals and principles advocated by leading thinkers and students of to-day will be found a healthy antidote to pessimism. Indeed, it will reveal an opportunity and a hope of quite splendid promise. The modern concept of education, formulated with strict reference to the fostering of human development, and on lines of purely scientific study, constitutes a demand for religion and a vindication of its essential place in all sound training, for which we cannot be sufficiently thankful. If religion is neglected it is not the fault of the educationalists.

So sweeping a statement obviously needs justification. At a time when philosophy

and psychology have been described as in a state of chaos, and when a vast number of experts have been devoting themselves to educational research, is it possible to claim that they speak with any sort of unanimity? Starting as they do from widely differing conceptions of the nature of reality and the constitution of human personality, it is inevitable that in details they will often disagree. But an impartial survey of their writings will disclose behind the divergencies an underlying and almost unanimous agreement in matters of principle. As contrasted with the old idea which thought of the child as primarily a receptacle for instruction and the teacher as concerned with imparting information, the modern outlook is absolutely united in demanding a radical change of view.

This change consists in an enlargement of the scope of education so as to include not merely the acquiring of knowledge,

but the development of personality. It is, indeed, with persons that the task of the teacher is concerned. His aim, first to last, is to enable his pupils to grow up not only qualified to discharge a particular vocation, but to become as perfect individuals and as worthy members of the community as their nature and talents permit. Knowledge and skill, important as they are, only form one part of our equipment for life : they are elements in character, but not the whole, or indeed the most important part of it. No education is worthy of the name unless its methods are adapted to this wider objective, unless it promotes fullness of æsthetic and moral, as well as intellectual and economic, worth.

Stated baldly this may seem a mere platitude. If so, it is patent that we do not yet regard it as such. To secure recognition it must overcome deep-seated prejudices—prejudices reinforced by the

special circumstances of the time. Too many of us still assume that fitness for church-membership depends upon ability to repeat a catechism, or that the chief qualification of a teacher is knowledge of his subject, rather than the power to love and influence children. And the rigour of competition for a livelihood, the immense growth of knowledge, and consequently the need of concentration upon a single subject, the emphasis upon material success, the system of examinations and prizes, and even the tendency of certain psychologists to split up the unity of human personality into a multiplicity of interests—all these foster methods of sectional training, of "cramming," and of early specialisation which militate against the true growth of personality. The product of such training may develop mastery of a particular branch of learning: too often all other qualities of his nature are stunted and atrophied. "He was born a

child of God: He died a Professor of Divinity" is an epitaph that may well conceal a retrograde biography.

This stress upon the wholeness of the organism is in marked contrast with tendencies till lately prominent. The analysis of human nature has its value: but if it results in regarding man as a bundle of faculties or of instincts loosely tied together, it is false to fact and dangerous in its results. The whole self is to a greater or less degree involved in any vital activity of feeling, thought, or action. What we do or think or feel influences not merely one, but every element in our nature. The child learning a Scripture lesson is influenced, and therefore educated, not only by what is deliberately taught, but by its feelings towards the teacher, its interest in the subject, its like or dislike of school, the attitude of its companions, the cheerfulness of its surroundings, and a multitude of other considerations; and any one of

them may make a deeper impression than the actual facts learned. "Give me the right sort of teacher: I don't mind what he teaches" is a testimony—perhaps exaggerated, but essentially sound—to the importance of the other factors in education.

For, with this multitude of impressions being made upon it, the child inevitably selects from among them consciously or subconsciously. What determines our first choices, why it is that certain incidents remain indelibly fixed in our minds and certain qualities impressed upon our characters, is difficult to define precisely; for the process begins with life itself in the phase of infancy, where memory cannot penetrate and exact observation is impossible. At first our method is mainly, if not solely, that of trial and error; later on experience of the previous consequences influences our decision, and imagination forecasts what the result of a particular

action will be; gradually by choosing what attracts we gain knowledge of what is in our interest and develop lines of definite policy, thus building up a character to which certain qualities or actions appeal while others are repellent. The self grows as it organises its experiences in relation to a stable centre of interest, to which all the pursuits and activities that attract us are related and which links them together in an integrated whole. When there is no strong centre, we get the dilettante, the type that flits from one occupation to another without consistency or settled purpose. Where the centre is not strong enough to attach itself to interests that attract us, although alien to our main purpose in life, we get subsidiary centres formed, and the individual becomes a piece of patchwork, coloured partly, say, by his devotion to home and parents and legitimate ambitions, partly by a passion for excitement which, having no relation

to his chief interest, is kept secret and expresses itself in surreptitious gambling. Only where the centre of interest is rich in values, only as it embraces the content of a full and good life, will it unify and order all the legitimate aspirations of human nature, and at once inspire and control the exercise of all its faculties. Such an interest, at once dominant and satisfying, is the supreme condition of happy and effective living. It should be the chief task of education to discover such an interest and foster its acceptance. For only if we seek to serve a worthy end and feel that our work is related to real values shall we learn with zest.

At this point an objection may be raised. It is well enough to insist that it matters more what sort of a person a child is becoming than what it learns ; but the child will have to earn its living, and ought to contribute to human welfare ; and, if so, in either case it will want technical skill and

concentration on a particular field of study. These "Jacks of all trades" may be fine human beings; but one does not become a great musician without years of practice, or a great biologist without devoting one's energy to research. In these days one must specialise. True: and a most valuable warning. But in order to become an expert it is not necessary to cease to be a fully developed human being. A man is none the worse a surgeon or engineer because he sees his special work in relation to other pursuits and an end larger than itself. His devotion to a particular task will no doubt prevent his giving time enough to become excellent in other spheres: it is doubtful whether he will ever become eminent at all if his special subject is not related to a wide and integrated outlook. The reason for this is plain if we consider more closely the conditions which make for great achievement. If a man's interests are divided between

many centres without falling into any organised and single plan, there will be constant wastage from internal conflict: his inclinations will pull him in different directions; he will "haver" between alternate courses; his life will be cut up into compartments. This inevitably means a leakage of power, a distraction of aim, a lack of zest and whole-hearted exercise of his faculties, a measure of discontent and unhappiness. Compare such a case of dissipated, because unconcentrated, strength with the incredible resources of power revealed by those whose whole self is mastered by an overwhelming impulse that fuses the personality into a harmonious unity. We all know the surprising effects of such an integration in our moments of supreme endeavour: but what happens then spasmodically is true, if less noticeable, in our normal lives. The man whose personality is organised by a single and consistently followed ideal will possess power

just because he is free from psychic dislocations. The degree to which organisation can be achieved will depend on the worth of that ideal. If an ideal can be found capable of absorbing, exercising, and uniting in its pursuit the whole self, the man will come to his full stature.

We ask, then, what are the conditions which constitute a satisfying centre of interest or ideal. It must be such as to determine a man's attitude towards the whole of his environment, towards the world of matter and "things," the world of life and human society, and the world of values, that "realm of ends" in which alone we can find an ultimate explanation of life. If we may put it in more familiar words, it must be such as to "preserve body, soul, and spirit entire."[1]

(1) Man's most elementary contact is with the physical, and to it he must learn

[1] If psychologists rebel at such a phrase they may be reminded of J. Ward, *Essays*.

to adjust himself. When Bergson called our species *Homo faber* rather than *Homo sapiens*, he drew attention to a fact which at once separates the lowest human being from the highest of the animals. Man is distinguished by his power to manipulate and make use of materials : in his efforts to control his environment, to supplement his weaknesses by the aid of tools, and to find enrichment and means of self-expression, he developed through the ages his ingenuity, his arts and crafts, his subtlety of hand and brain. The rigidity of natural law which often fills sensitive spirits with a sense of helplessness is, in fact, the condition necessary to man's evolution : as he learns to adjust himself to what he discovers, to obey, and by obeying to dominate, his inventive powers expand and his mind is sharpened and disciplined. The educational value of our physical environment can hardly be over-estimated ; and its influence affects not only our mental,

but our moral and spiritual growth. The man who has learned to be master of things enjoys full, rich, and healthy life. He is free at once from the morbid asceticism which shrinks from contact with what can so easily be misused, and from the sensuality characteristic of those who are the slaves of their possessions. It is easy to despise the body as the tomb or prison-house of the soul, and to accept, for others if not for oneself, material conditions which stunt and degrade humanity. It is still easier to become so dependent upon "goods" as to allow the acquisition of them to become the unacknowledged motive of one's life. Our social value, and, as Professor Hocking has pointed out, our "likeableness," depend upon a right attitude here. The dualism which condemns the physical as evil and the materialism which regards it as the sole reality are both attractive philosophies : but they are both false and ultimately meaningless ; and

both are educationally worthless. It is no small proof of the grand originality of Jesus that at a time when the East was dominated by dualism and the West by materialistic Stoicism He refused each alternative.

(2) Still more important for our growth, and on a higher plane of educational value, is our relationship with persons. Man is eminently " a social animal," and it is in the intimate contact of life with life that human personality is developed and moulded. From birth onwards our reactions to the people around us are the chief sources of our training; and their influence upon us is intimate and subtle. Potent as are the effects of heredity, it seems probable that they are far less significant than the scientists of a generation ago were inclined to claim. Early associations, the unconscious acceptance or rejection of the example of others, likes and dislikes which we have not begun to

control, fix our characters almost indelibly. The responsibility that rests upon parents and teachers is so vast as to be literally terrifying. Many of us may have been appalled at the severity with which Jesus warned His hearers of the judgment upon "every idle word": studies of the psychology of infancy and childhood underline for us His meaning, as they demonstrate the almost irreparable consequences of casual and half-conscious deed or speech. And our influence upon others, and especially upon the immature, comes from what we are, not from what we pretend to be or strive to appear. Our utterances may be strictly correct, our behaviour schooled to propriety, but if we are unloving, and therefore unloved, the real quality of our natures will give the lie to our teaching and provoke revulsion against it. Unless the teacher is himself "the right sort of person," he will not enable his pupils to grow up as he desires: example is stronger

than precept ; worth is imparted by infection rather than by instruction.

To achieve a right relationship to society is to avoid two contrasted dangers, each arising out of an exaggerated emphasis upon one of the two factors whose mutual adjustment is in question. We wish to secure harmony between the claims of the individual upon his fellows and the claims of the community upon its members ; and to strike a true balance is not easy. Initiative, independence, individuality—these are necessary and precious : education must foster them. But to do so may well be to produce a character hard and self-centred, that sets itself to dominate and exploit others and may easily become actively anti-social. The optimism of the early economists which assumed that in serving his own interests a man must necessarily promote the well-being of his fellows is no longer maintainable : along that road lie selfishness, loneliness, and the

loss of all that makes for true fullness of life. Yet the opposite tendency is hardly less destructive. It is easy, under the pretext of developing social qualities, to become amiable without principles, pliant and unstable, always at the mercy of the last craze or the newest acquaintance, one who drifts through existence without rudder or compass. It should be noted that such a character can easily excuse itself by fine talk of fellowship or patriotism, friendliness or self-sacrifice. Much that passes for sportsmanship is, in fact, moral cowardice and anæmia : we can all shout with the crowd, " Crucify him ; away with him ! "

Teachers will, of course, recognise that in the normal process of growth the child passes from one phase to the other. There is a time at which he lives for the " pack," when he is miserable unless he can run in company, when loyalty to a group of equals dominates his whole conduct. And there

is a time when he will walk alone, seeing himself as the lonely hero of his day-dreams, proud of his independence and resolute to stand on his own feet. Such phases are natural and almost universal, and are only dangerous if they become fixed—if growth is arrested at them and the individual cannot pass on to a truer adjustment. The " strong, silent he-man " beloved of sentimental novelists is just the schoolboy who has never developed beyond the egoism and self-consciousness of puberty. The society butterfly who must at all costs be in the fashion has had her progress stopped at a still earlier phase. No philosophy of life, no centre of interest, which does not enable us to surpass this dilemma and reach a right relationship between ourselves and our social environment will be ultimately satisfying.

Moreover, in these days such social environment is one of world citizenship. The story of pedagogics is full of records

of types of local, national, and racial characteristics, where a dominant ideal so permeated the homes and schools and universities as to mould the bulk of its products after a similar pattern. How far this influence rather than heredity has been responsible for the broad groupings of mankind may be uncertain : much that is loosely spoken of as innate, many of those generalisations that we utter in regard to the temperament and heritage of men of other language or colour, plainly refer to qualities that are not inborn, but acquired in early training. Inheritance seems to bestow rather aptitudes in this or that direction which dispose towards ease or difficulty of development than fixed qualities which the teacher must regard as ultimate determinants of character. In any case and in these days we shall not be satisfied with an ideal that is incapable of universal application. We must aim, not at producing good Americans or fine

Nordic types, but at good human beings—fine men and women ; and our model must be such that all nations can recognise it as their own. For only in the fellowship of a world-wide community can the individual of to-day find his full stature. It is, again, a proof of the grandeur of Jesus that, in spite of centuries of European and Western interpretation, He resists all our efforts to give Him national or racial features. If we unconsciously select from Him those aspects which suit our present outlook, men of different tradition discover and disclose in Him what we have failed to appreciate. For them, as for us, He can be claimed as the desire of all nations.

(3) It is sufficiently obvious that if we are to settle rightly our relationship with things and persons we must look beyond them. Particular adjustments are ultimately determined by our general outlook upon life as a whole. The ends which we think valuable, the motives which are part

and parcel of ourselves, the ideals, conscious or unconscious, which we set before us—these decide not only the main bent of our natures, but our reaction to the events of every day. We may profess to be indifferent to beauty, or bored with abstract ideas, or sceptical about conscience and moral obligation ; we may set down philosophy as " high-brow " and religion as " make-believe " : yet, obscure and unacknowledged, a philosophy, however jejune, a religion, however inadequate, is shaping our policy and deciding our behaviour. Man cannot live, does not live, without reference to ends outside himself and his society. Honest investigation, whether of our own lives or of the course of history, will reveal that it is general principles, the principles which we sometimes profess to despise and of which, if they were revealed to us, we should often be ashamed, that make us what we are.

Children, as Professor Hocking pointed out, at Jerusalem, are, in fact, incurably metaphysical. As soon as they begin to think, they begin to ask questions. What is the world made of? Why do things behave as they do? Where did all these people come from? How were they born, and what happens to them when they die? What is it all about? How can I make sense of it? Who made it, and what does He mean it to be? All the questions lead up to this. All express an insatiable curiosity for understanding of the nature and purpose of reality. And the child is not easily put off, as every parent knows. We may escape awkward problems by facile or evasive replies; and for the moment our inquisitor will retire baffled, but unsatisfied. Sometimes his confidence in us is shaken: he chokes down his desire to know, or seeks another guide. But it is hard to kill this native passion for the ultimate. Each one of us must fashion

somehow an explanation of the riddle with what help we can get. And the answer that we accept is our religion, or at least our theology.

Moreover, besides curiosity, there is a deeper quality which urges us to the quest. While psychologists were arguing at length and without clear results whether or no a religious instinct should be included in their analysis of human nature, Dr. Otto has done splendid service in drawing attention to the universality of "the idea of the holy." Starting as a mere awe at the mystery that is felt to underlie the universe, taking on an emotional tone not far from dread among primitive peoples, gathering a richer content as moral quality was attached to it, inspiring man's first essays in art and myth-making and ethical taboos, it is this sense of the numinous which supplies the basis for the mysticism that is the essence of all religion. Experienced vaguely in childhood, such

cosmic consciousness often awakens and becomes active in adolescence, and, if wisely fostered and related to a general concept of reality, can bring not only a deepening of the whole nature, but a poise and perspective to the judgment and the desires. Sages have always exhorted us to live eternally, and to form our opinions and conduct *sub specie æternitatis* : here is the element within us which can enable us to respond to their advice.

Yet here, too, there is danger. Unless our apprehension of totality is expressed in suitable intellectual, æsthetic, and moral shape it will become a haunting will-o'-the-wisp, and be dismissed as altogether nebulous and illusory. Or it may be allowed to play the part of a " compensation," providing a centre for a dream-world of fantasy in which the dreamer can find refuge from the stresses and failures of his life. A person of the former type will regard religion, despite the

evidence of its significance and worth, as an unpractical idealism, and, quenching in himself every aspiration towards it, end by becoming insensitive to it and to the values that are associated with it. The latter, contrasting the delights of his musings with the severities of " the world " and flattering a subtle vanity by " spiritual " indulgence, supplies the sort of futile, useless, and morbidly self-centred ecstatic whose existence fosters the cynical belief that all religion is a disease. In both the religious element, instead of serving as a centre of integration, has been dissociated from the other interests : so long as it is allowed to remain isolated from or opposed to our relationships with things and persons, it cannot fulfil the possibilities inherent in it ; and religion, as often understood and practised, does not, in fact, fulfil them.

Are we, then, to take the line of dispensing with the attempt to control the child's

adjustment to the realm of ends? This we cannot do without ceasing to be educators; for it is only in this realm that stable principles and a coherent attitude can be formed. Few would dispute that it is in man's perception of beauty, truth, and goodness, in his aspiration after reality, in his sense of the contrast between what is and what ought to be, and his endeavours to raise the world to the level of his ideals, that we find the noblest quality of human nature. We cannot leave this quality out of account because it is difficult and has been misused. To do so is to abandon our search for a centre of interest, and to restrict our education to the imparting of knowledge and of vocational skill. Moreover, it is to deprive our pupils of the best that their nature demands, to leave them unhelped in their efforts to find an ultimate meaning in life, and to fail to hand on to them the noblest elements in man's hard-won

achievement. If the desire to make sense of the world is natural and legitimate, if there is any validity in the deepest experiences of humanity, we cannot shirk our duty or refuse to help them here. Here more than anywhere they have a right to something positive—the best that we can give them. To attempt to foster the growth of character while starving it of its most important food is to cut ourselves off by our own action from any possibility of accomplishing our end. We shall not be able to prevent them forming a philosophy of life or adopting principles and standards of value: all we shall do is to secure that they are left, for our part, at the mercy of other and casual influences, to the pull of low ideals and selfish aims, to superstition and idolatries. "Education without religion is almost a contradiction in terms"[1]; for unless education fosters the appreciation of æsthetic, intellectual,

[1] *World Mission of Christianity*, p. 21.

and moral values, satisfies man's aspiration after eternal reality, and enables him to fashion his whole relationship—physical, social, spiritual—into a coherent unity, it fails ; and religion alone among man's interests is concerned with these things and can claim to achieve them.

THE CONTENT OF RELIGIOUS EDUCATION

IV

THE CONTENT OF RELIGIOUS EDUCATION

Such a description of the place of religion in education, when compared with the account already given of our failures and with the fact that many states and many teachers regard religious teaching as outside the function of their schools, may well occasion a certain measure of surprise. If it can be argued by competent and impartial students that "education must take much of its inspiration from the pressing need of to-day for a more adequate adjustment of the individual to the totality of existence,"[1] how is it that secular systems are so generally adopted? It can hardly be argued that a curriculum

[1] Chapman & Count, *Principles of Education*, p. 356.

from which all reference to religion is omitted can "give the deeper insight which would lend significance to the daily task"; yet in many countries both of East and West, and those not the least progressive, such an omission is not only tolerated, but enforced. It may be natural that, in China or Turkey, Western missionaries should advocate a secular State-system rather than one in which Confucianism or Islam was made compulsory, though the attitude of Indian Christians differs from them. But we find the same policy adopted in the United States, although no country is more open in its public avowal of Christianity and none has paid closer attention to the theory and practice of education.

The causes of this apparent discrepancy between facts and ideals are worthy of brief attention. They are complex, and differ in different localities, but the

following would seem to be the most important.

First there is the fact that at the time when public education was initiated in the West there was still a strong feeling that religion was, if not a matter of private concern, at least a subject too intimate and personal to be properly handled in the classroom. Education was regarded primarily as instruction; religion was rather a matter of experience and of conversion. Traces of this outlook still remain, and we shall discuss it when we consider the position of education in religious effort.

Secondly, and akin to this, is the view that to allow the State to indoctrinate the younger generation with religious or political creeds is dangerous. In these fields, freedom to form one's own judgment is essential; we have no right to impose ready-made schemes upon the immature. In science and mathematics

and languages, and to a less extent in literature and history, the personal prejudices of the teacher are less important; all that is needed is an objective statement and interpretation of facts. Religion cannot be taught without intimate and personal reference. Religious tests for teachers are open to grave objection; modern States have repealed their Test Acts; yet can we allow, or rather compel, untested persons to form the religious opinions of our children?

Thirdly, and probably far more influential, is the fact that in religion, more than in any other subject, there is wide and acute divergence of view. It is an ironical comment upon the bitterness of sectarian feeling that many, if not most, Christians would say, "Better no religion at all than the religion of a denomination to which I do not belong." If Dr. Parkes Cadman could say of the United States, "The Churches were largely responsible

for taking religion out of the public schools of America,"[1] the disunion of Christians has had almost similar effects elsewhere. In a matter so urgent for the welfare of the children it ought not to be impossible to frame a syllabus upon which the Reformed Churches at least could agree; yet the suggestion seems to many so quixotic, and to some so detestable, that instead of it they choose secular education. The *odium theologicum* is still so potent that we can hardly blame statesmen or educationalists if they prefer a mutilated and incomplete curriculum to one which will create such bitter controversy.

Finally, as has already been admitted, Christianity has too often been taught in so ill-considered a form, and with such lack of wise grading and technique, that its results have not proved sufficiently valuable to make its adoption a self-evident gain.

[1] Federal Council Bulletin, 1927.

Yet, when all is said, such reasons must appear woefully inadequate in view of the need for religion in education and of the issues involved in its exclusion. If it be true from the study of pedagogics that growth depends upon integration, and integration is achieved in the service of a dominant purpose and will be complete in proportion to the worth of that purpose, it is equally true for the Christian that man is meant for the service of God, is restless and frustrated till he rests in Him, and can only come to perfection as he grows towards the fullness of the stature of Christ. It is the future of our children that is at stake; and the Churches are allowing them to be starved because they cannot give them their whole loaf nor decide which half shall be eaten. Jesus had stern words for those blind guides who strain out the gnat and swallow the camel: it would seem that they are still appropriate.

For if it be urged that the efforts of the State to secure an adequate training in secular subjects are in fact supplemented by the religious bodies in Sunday schools, children's guilds, Bible classes, and a multitude of effective voluntary agencies, it must be answered that such a division between sacred and profane studies is open to fatal objection. It cannot but create in the minds of the pupils a sense of contrast between the two spheres: for the major part of their schooling religion is of no obvious account; they are being equipped for life without reference to it; then, as an extra, in different buildings and by different teachers, they are given another type of education. It is always difficult for us to adjust the relationship between our earthly and our heavenly citizenship, to weld all our pursuits and interests into a unity of design. Under such circumstances the difficulty is enormously increased. We rejoice in the

devoted work that is being done in our Sunday schools and by our Christian teachers and class-leaders; but they are working under a grave handicap.

"Do you then seriously suggest that Christian teaching should be given by the State and that the whole curriculum should have a religious aim and background? Remember Tennessee, and the evidence of obscurantism when educational work falls under the control of ecclesiastics." It is a natural and justifiable objection. It has often been the case that Christians have taken a narrow and bigoted view of their religion, that in a time of rapid change like that of the past century they have been slow to welcome fresh knowledge which seemed at first sight to threaten cherished beliefs, and that as educationalists they have accepted principles of indoctrination which are in reality radically unsound. We would confess that such fears and objections are legitimate, unless the Churches

can put forward proof of their ability to agree upon the content and method of religious education and can win the approval for it of responsible educationalists. But we believe that, in face of so great a need, their task in examining the meaning and presentation of Christianity is not insuperable; that with good will they could arrive at a large measure of unity; and that in their efforts they could rely upon the sympathy of the teaching profession and of the responsible leaders of public opinion.

For there is, as the unanimity with which the report on the Christian message was received at Jerusalem demonstrates, already a far greater agreement among the Reformed Churches than is often supposed. There are in all lands, and particularly perhaps in the Christian schools of Asia and Africa, many outstanding examples of successful religious education. And there are Governments, like that of

the Gold Coast, which do not hesitate to assert the necessity for religion in the schools, and have taken practical steps to secure that it shall be taught, and taught thoroughly and wisely. For religious education further effort in all three directions is urgently needed. We ought to undertake systematic and united study in order to reach and express the best possible interpretation of the content of our faith, not in terms of a complete theological system, but in its applicability to the needs of learners. We ought also to give serious heed both to the pedagogic principles which should control our method and grading, and also to the experiments already being carried out by which those principles are illustrated and tested in practice. Finally, we ought to consider the whole subject of the attitude of secular authorities towards religious education, with the general desire to convince them of its importance but with special regard

to local circumstances. These three tasks might well receive particular and immediate attention from the International Missionary Council and its constituent bodies. With the first of them this chapter is concerned.

It is obvious that the broader aspect of educational work is linked up with the whole problem of the study of Christian belief and of the reunion of the several denominations. An agreed scheme of teaching should logically follow rather than precede agreement on doctrinal and institutional differences. The ideal procedure would certainly begin with the attempt to formulate an universal *corpus theologiæ*, and then to adapt this to the requirements of a teaching syllabus. And if so, in view of our divisions, must not all progress be indefinitely postponed? Is not the mere suggestion of a theological concordat absurd?

The experience of the last ten years of

Christian co-operation, and particularly the rapidly developing harmony between missionaries and among the newer Churches, make the prospect of such agreement far less remote than appears at first sight. Christians, where they are convinced of the compelling need for action and have a clearly defined object in view, discover that beneath divergencies of outlook and tradition there is in fact a measure of unity which covers most, if not all, of the fundamentals of religion and which it is not impossible to formulate. We are seeking, not for a complete " divine philosophy," but for a syllabus which we can use as the basis for Christian teaching to children and new converts ; we want agreement in certain practical and elementary matters, not upon the questions of Church order or precise doctrine which form the main causes of our present denominationalism. We have learned that, for example, in laying before students a

statement of the Christian position, denominational issues hardly arise. The World Student Christian Federation can employ the help of Episcopalians and Presbyterians, Baptists and Methodists and Quakers, without any sense of inappropriateness; and their messages show an almost identical content. If the officers of the Federation were asked to frame a scheme of teaching for its members, they would readily do so until the later stages of the programme were reached. Surely those whose work lies, not in the universities, but in the primary and secondary schools, would find such a task still easier. Their business is with the simple facts of the faith, with God and Jesus Christ, with the Christian character, with worship and service; and for children, at least after adolescence, the matters that divide us do not, and in any sound education could not, arise.

In its historical development the

Christian Church was generally united for the first centuries of its growth—united at least in its acceptance of the fact of Christ and in its expression of that life in daily conduct; formulated dogmas, fixed forms of worship, elaborate organisation, rigid institutional structure—these came later. It would obviously be a violation of sound educational principles to indoctrinate the child with these later elements in Christianity. We must begin at the beginning with Jesus and the experience of the earliest Christians. They supply the fundamentals; and on the value of their example all Christians are agreed. Our purpose, after all, is to help our pupils to become Christian, not to make them good Anglicans or good Lutherans. It was remarked at Jerusalem that where we desired to Christianise we had often only Americanised; the same will be true of our religious education if we do not distinguish between the fundamentals

and the later developments of the faith.

Taking, then, the New Testament as our model, it should be our task to determine the content of the revelation which Christ brought to the world, and to set ourselves to give this to our children, helping them to discover and apply it more and more fully, guiding them but not dictating the conclusions which they draw from it, respecting their personalities even when we realise their immaturity. To start anywhere else should be impossible ; to impose creeds and catechisms and the minutiæ of denominationalism upon them is to be false to the principles of education ; to follow the method of Jesus is to leave our pupils to develop at a later stage of growth the expression of their faith in appropriate forms of doctrine and order.

As regards the content of our religious education, the Council at Jerusalem called its members and Christian people to a

study of our Lord's teaching, believing that it supplied the proper subject-matter and suggested the sequence of its presentation.

It would seem, indeed, that His method provides a complete answer to the demands of modern educational science, and, incidentally, a striking contrast to the traditional type of teaching. He is concerned always with persons and their growth into freedom and fellowship; with enabling them so to apprehend reality as to relate to it all the daily activities of heart and mind and will; and with arousing in them a motive strong enough to unify and inspire and transform their whole selves. Pentecost and the sublime quality and achievements of the early Church are the proof of His success. Bearing in view what has been said about the requisites for a true education, it will be well to outline in greater detail these features of His work.

(1) That His purpose is the training of

personality so that it may be helped to attain fullness of life is obvious, not only from His repeated utterances, but from the characteristic emphases and omissions in His teaching. "Be ye therefore perfect," or full-grown—that is His goal ; but He has no cut-and-dried programme. He never deals with men in the mass, with averages or types or abstractions ; rather each individual is treated in accordance with his particular need. With one it is a wrong idea of God's character that has to be corrected ; with another, a mistaken understanding of a ritual observance ; with another, the habit of dilettantism ; with another, the pride of wealth ; with another, impetuosity and lack of stamina. He knows that each individual has his own special gifts and possibilities, needs and obstacles. Always He builds on what each possesses of positive ideal, always He helps him to discover further consequences involved in that ideal, consequences which,

if consistently accepted, will challenge the mistaken belief, repair the fault of character, and point the way to further growth. It is because He sees the end so clearly that He can show the ways by which different people can reach towards it. Loving His disciples and believing in them, He shares with them, as they can each best receive it, His outlook, infecting them through all the channels of their personalities. He is at once the supreme idealist in His vision of the eternal and the supreme realist in His sensitiveness to actual human want and weakness.

Yet He never forces assent, never imposes His teaching dogmatically, never forsakes the principle that His pupils must discover the truth of His lessons for themselves. He relies upon their ability to understand, stimulates their imagination, arouses their curiosity : if they " have ears to hear," then all is well ; if not, He will try again. " I call you, not slaves, but

friends," gives the keynote of His method. Even for their own good (as we should reckon it) He will not compel or dictate. They must be free to follow or to refuse, otherwise their growth will be checked or distorted. With an amazing patience He sets before them a wealth of hints, suggestions, paradoxes, poems, eliciting here and there a response, and, when they ask Him, explaining and illustrating anew. His refusal to give a sign, His warning to silence of those whom He has healed, His acceptance of betrayal and arrest—all these are in keeping with His respect for the personalities of others; neither by a spiritual *tour-de-force* nor by constraint of His authority will He bend others to His will.

Nevertheless the individual, though free, must find and exercise His freedom in fellowship. There is nothing of the lonely, self-sufficient " wise man " of the Stoics in His teaching. Men are to find their own true selves as they yield voluntarily to the

demands of love and service. Their freedom is not in caprice and self-will, but in obedience to an acknowledged loyalty. It is to membership in a commonwealth that He calls men, and their status in it depends, not upon their eminence, but upon their will to serve. The community must itself aim, not at its own welfare, but at the discharge of a specific and divine allegiance. Then, when it and its members alike "seek first God's Kingdom and righteousness," all else will fall into its proper place and relationship. Given the ideal, given the one supreme centre of interest, and all else, physical, social, spiritual, will be added. Individual and society moving in the same direction will develop without discord or conflict of loyalties.

(2) To build up a consistent and harmonious personality, a high aim is the first requisite. But, as history and experience demonstrate, the ideal may by its very

grandeur become divorced from the events of ordinary and mundane life. The good news of the Kingdom of God was not in itself new; prophets and sages before Christ had proclaimed the sovereignty of the Most High, and even striven to break down the taboos and exclusiveness with which men thought to honour Him. The teaching of Jesus is unique not so much in its concentration upon God as in the way in which He links up with God the daily deeds and words of mankind.

He came to a people for whom religion involved the acceptance of an elaborate code of rules, of fixed times and modes of worship, of an absolute barrier between the sacred and the profane. The result was a reverence which, while intending to safeguard the majesty of God, tended to create a cleavage between His service and the common tasks and pleasures. For Jesus, as for the scientist of to-day, God was either in all or in none: He could not be

confined or partial: He could have no favourites: all times and places were His; all simple duties were a ministry. If love is the law, then love must include enemies as well as friends; if men are brethren, then the Samaritan and the Canaanite are within the family; if the earth is the Lord's, then seed-time and harvest and the activities of those who sow and reap will be "mysteries of the Kingdom"; if certain days and places are set apart, it is not that they are exclusively holy, but that they may help men to hallow all human existence. So He set Himself to bring religion into intimate association with the daily occupations of men and women, teaching them, not by metaphysics or catechisms, not by precepts and prohibitions, but by poems and parables drawn from homely and familiar happenings. The building of a house, the ploughing of a field, fishing and husbandry, baking and housewifery, trade and speculation, weddings and the play

of children—these furnish the material of His lessons. His object is not to tell His hearers about God so much as to enable them to experience the consciousness of His reality, and hence to discover His nature and purpose, not as something remote or academic, but as a vital element permeating the whole fabric of their existence. Only in the light of what they themselves are, and are becoming, will they form a true concept of God. As they live in Him they will live eternally, sublimating all their energies as these are increasingly controlled and unified by awareness of, and co-operation with, the divine will. Religion is not to be the self-conscious performance of certain duties, but the spontaneous expression of God-possessed personalities. While He never neglects or depreciates the value of cults or creeds, He sees them always as a means to this larger end; and by the severity of His warnings He shows how easily and

disastrously they may become obstacles to its attainment.

(3) Finally, His teaching has its consummation in His appeal to a motive which shall have power to effect a complete conversion of the whole selves of His pupils. God and God's Kingdom, majestic and universal as they are, may well be something remote from the actual life-stuff of mankind. It may be doubted whether the eternal, however variously expressed and apprehended through the imagery of royalty, of judgeship, of creative love, of fatherhood, will ever be realised by human beings with sufficient vividness to evoke a passionate and transforming response. Always there is the sense that these images are metaphors, inadequate and possibly mistaken symbols of a reality still remote and elusive and in its essence unknowable. Neither art nor philosophy—nothing, indeed, but human life itself—can be fully the *speculum Domini* ; if personality is the

supreme quality of mankind, it must be in terms of personality that God will be supremely manifested. Jesus, revealing God in a multitude of lesser images, revealed Him uniquely as incarnate in Himself.

It is, in fact, the discovery of God in Christ, of the divinity of the Son of Man, that has been the revolutionary element in Christianity. Here is that which converts, that which brings us into the vital relationship with the eternal that we call salvation. And its potency is not due solely to the fact that, confessing Jesus as Son of God, we see in Him the "express image" of the Father and can appreciate in concrete form the very Being of deity. Rather it springs from the new relationship thus made possible for us, as God becomes the object, not only of contemplation and worship, but of love—the love of person for Person, of man for Man. Thus reverence and aspiration are quickened into a

passion of communion; imitation is no longer a matter of observance, but of fellowship; perfection becomes attainable, not by a process of conscious self-discipline, but in unconscious fulfilment of the principle that we become what we love. Psychologists, in showing us that the influence of a teacher is vastly more subtle and penetrating than the mere effect of his words or even his example, have enabled us to understand how enormously the relationship to God established by the Incarnation exceeds that which is based only upon other means of revelation. "I live; yet not I: Christ lives in me," is a summary of the transmutation thus achieved—a transmutation otherwise impossible.

If we can find the eternal far more adequately as incarnate in a person than as embodied in a tale or described by a philosophy or expressed in poem and music, then love will be the master motive

in religious—that is, in truly educated—growth. Yet though for the disciples the confession of St. Peter inaugurated the new epoch, love, thus finding its divine object in Jesus, had to be purified and fixed before it could fully control them. Jesus, having allowed His followers to discover their centre of interest in Himself, had then to clear the new relationship of unworthy associations, and finally to consummate it by revealing Himself in a supreme and characteristic act.

The process of purgation, if so we may describe it, was neither short nor easy. A group of men influenced by enthusiasm, and in a moment of insight, so far overcame the prejudices of their upbringing as to acknowledge their Master as the Christ, the unique representative of God to man, and man to God. How far this acknowledgment carried with it what we should now call belief in the divinity of Jesus may be doubted; probably it involved

at least the recognition that He had for them the "value" of God. But, even so, they could not but carry over into the new age concepts of deity belonging to tradition. They could not all at once re-shape their ideas of the divine character; God was a term that carried a known significance, to which, if Jesus were the Christ, they expected Him to conform. Thus and thus He must act if He is to sustain the rôle of Godhead; their hearts acclaimed Him, their minds and wills have still to be brought into agreement with the claim. Hence for Him there is a fresh phase of educative work as He helps them to re-think and re-express their whole religious outlook and activity. Their conduct proves how little they are yet integrated, how often their thoughts and actions belie their faith. If Jesus is divine, then God is like Jesus. The Church has never found it easy to accept so drastic a revaluation of the concept of deity. Yet,

if religious education is to be adequate, it must present its ideal unalloyed by conventional accretions, undiminished by compromises with mundane and non-Christian elements. A devoted Jesus-worship is not enough; too often it means an Arian contrast between the Son and the Father. Christianity involves an interpretation of God and the universe in terms of the person and teaching of its Lord.

The fixing of the new motive, when a multitude of impressions and half-understood glimpses were summed up in a single decisive and dramatic revelation, brought the whole process to its completion. Love, for us men, reaches its full potency when it can fasten upon the memory of some perfect moment, some special scene by which the full nature of the beloved was illuminated. It was on the Cross, in the condensed light of Passiontide, that Jesus was thus supremely manifested. There His previous teaching was recapitulated,

His significance consummated and enhanced, His nature displayed in all its splendour of triumphant suffering. There the redemptive life of God received its perfect symbol and instrument for the effective redemption of mankind. Men could find in Jesus crucified the concrete and representative expression, not only of what He Himself is, but of His full significance for them. As in the mysteries of Eleusis dramatic and allegorical scenes typified lessons of profound and evasive import, so here in a single historical event is a mystery which reveals the innermost reality of the universe. Men might miss the lesson diffused over the life-story of Jesus ; they could hardly be blind to its meaning when thus conveyed. Jesus crucified thenceforward became the centre of religious and therefore of universal attention ; His cross the sign and standard of Christendom, the summary of the content of its faith. Mankind, even at the

zenith of its display of successful egoism, has always been haunted by the conviction that there existed a yet more excellent way. Sages like Plato had wistfully surmised that crucifixion would await the righteous; saints like the Buddha had exalted renunciation to the disparagement of all active achievement; Jesus proclaimed the secret for which they were striving when He brought good out of evil and revealed the truly creative life as that of suffering, but not therefore passive, love. Here was no failure, no mere negation, but the power of God and the wisdom of God—a power attested at Pentecost, a wisdom justified by her children.

Here, then, is the witness of Jesus to the content of religious education. Religion as seen in Him accomplishes the development of individuals and of society; gives a coherent and integrated scheme of life; supplies a motive adequate to enlist our whole attention. Yet the earliest disciples

only grew to a full acceptance and response through a process of training; and their growth was due, not only to the content of their Master's teaching, but to its sequence and method. It is not enough to state the former; we must see how far we in our day can appreciate and employ the latter also. Else we may fail, not, indeed, in intention, but in results.

THE METHOD OF RELIGIOUS EDUCATION

V

THE METHOD OF RELIGIOUS EDUCATION

A. The Elements Involved

If modern education aims rather at fostering personality than at imparting information, the change of ideal naturally involves a wide alteration in method. The study of the psychology of childhood and adolescence has disclosed to us not only a clearer knowledge of the conditions favourable to harmonious development, but a fresh and deeper understanding both of the methods by which new ideas are naturally assimilated and of the normal stages at which they can most readily be presented. As with physical diet, so with the material of education, we must adapt what we have to offer to the appetite and

digestion of our charges; otherwise, however excellent the food, it may produce results entirely unlike what we desire. It is not easy to separate questions of technique in education from those of grading. But certain general matters concerning the scope and mode of our teaching should be considered before we approach more detailed problems as to the arrangement and sequence of lessons. If in the present chapter we confine our attention to the work of schools and educational institutions, this is not to limit education to them; but only to consider it in its most obvious sphere. What is here said of younger pupils can readily be applied to disciples of very different ages and conditions.

We have seen that for education in general there is grave need of some unifying subject which shall enable students of special departments to relate their work to a broad outlook upon the whole range

of human life. How to prevent the expert from becoming a mere lop-sided specialist; how to combine technical and advanced knowledge of science or the classics with a recognition of the existence and value of other pursuits; how to create a sense of the wholeness and oneness of truth—these are problems which affect every school beyond the junior primary stage, and in principle arise at the very outset of life. Similarly for religion, if it is to be, as it were, the cement that binds together the whole structure of character, the greatest danger is of its occupying just one out of the many divisions in the syllabus. It must be taught; religious knowledge and instruction cannot be omitted; and this is best done by a specially qualified teacher. But if it comes to be regarded as his or her sole province, if an expert assumes control of religion as another does of history or mathematics, the result will be unsatisfactory. For religion stands on a different

footing from all other subjects in its relation to the whole purpose of the school and to every member of it.

To avoid these difficulties should be the task of the staff as a whole; and, given goodwill and a clear understanding of the main purpose of education, co-operation should be easy. It is not wise or practicable to insist upon religious tests for teachers, or to attempt to restrict their teaching to what is commonly supposed to be orthodox. Scientists must be free to teach all that they know: the methods suggested in Tennessee are destructive of the sincerity without which no educational work can prosper. Nor is it the business of the teacher of other subjects to be giving his lessons an apologetic or propagandist bias. His business is with truth as he sees it. But if he realises his share in the central task of the school, he will be slow to defeat that end by suggesting that one subject is in conflict with another, or that he has

the whole of knowledge as his prerogative. If he is a sound educator he will aim at something more than a monopoly of his pupil's interest : he will realise that he is a colleague of others, and that together they have to help towards fullness of growth ; he will teach as a member of a team. As such he will acknowledge the importance of the religious element in life, even if he cannot himself accept a dogmatic statement of faith. If the teachers in a school or college could be asked to discuss from time to time the bearing of their special function upon the whole character-building work of the institution, and the relationship of each particular department to the rest, much might be done to promote sound and well-considered growth among the pupils. Too often schools take their tone, not from the co-operation of the staff, but from one or two strong individualists who stand out in contrast to the other members. It is rare

to find a school in which each teacher realises his joint responsibility and serves the welfare of the whole rather than of his own particular subject or interest.

So, too, for those responsible for religious instruction: they must seek the collaboration of their colleagues with sympathy for the worth, the religious worth, of all other work; they must realise that religion is not confined to lessons from the Bible, but is involved in each aspect of the curriculum; and they must strive so to teach as to help their pupils to discover the religious significance of every honest pursuit. It is more important for them than for others to be human in their intercourse with their pupils, to have a broad outlook and wide interests, and to avoid so far as possible the idea that their special duty gives them a privileged position as representing the religious life of the school.

Further, to this end the centre of school-life should be in common worship: this

rather than instruction ought to be the essential religious activity. Children, and their elders also, need and appreciate worship, even if other aspects of religion perplex or repel them. If it is true of jarring sectarians that they are united when they are on their knees, it is true also of the generality of mankind. In the presence of the Holy, our differences seem petty and our difficulties trivial : realising God, we realise also our fellowship. Particular care should be given to the study of types of worship suitable to the young, to the simplicity and dignity of the service, and to the sincerity with which it is conducted. Beauty of architecture and ornament, of word and music, should be regarded as essential ; for we are all artists before we are scientists or philosophers ; and beauty does not necessarily involve expense or elaboration. Where a chapel can be built or a room set apart, it should be open always, and the children should be

encouraged to come into it in spare moments; but there are advantages in occasionally holding services in classrooms or elsewhere. We should encourage a child's natural awe, while helping him to feel that God is real and near.

Means should also be found to let the religion of the school and its members express itself in acts of service adapted to the age and character of the pupils. For adolescents social work which brings them into touch with children whose lives are spent in harder conditions can be enormously valuable. Anything that makes concrete the needs of others and of the world or that promotes sympathy with those of different social or racial status will help to call out the desire for a life of usefulness, and do more than many talks to evoke a sense of vocation. Children are not born snobbish or with colour prejudices; and personal contact is the surest method of preventing them from becoming

so. The many movements which promote a healthy comradeship in vacation camps or urban settlements ought to be potent means of arousing desire for service, revealing opportunities for it, and creating an appreciation of the realities of the world-situation.

All education should aim both at awakening a sense of the largeness and mystery of the universe and at relating book-learning to practical work. Religious teaching should keep these two aims constantly in view: it should be both idealistic and realistic, stimulating the desire to explore and enquire, and appealing to facts and familiar events. Too often it has failed in both directions: its dogmas have foreclosed speculation and substituted bewilderment for wonder; its illustrations have been remote from life, and productive rather of pietism than of consecration. If we can recover something of the outlook of Jesus, for whom God is the

supreme reality and common things and common people are full of interest and value, for whom there is no sense of contrast between religion and life, since all life is religious and all religion a fullness of life, we shall recover with it something of His spirit of worship and sacrifice, adoration and ministry. And only as we are ourselves sharing in His quality will our teaching infect and influence others.

It is obvious that in this field, above all, the scope of our teaching must be related to the particular needs of our pupils, and that no detailed consideration of a syllabus can be of universal application. In different types of schools, in different areas and among different races, there will be special requirements which nothing except local knowledge can supply. Our aim is the same, wherever we are: the broad principles underlying our work will not vary greatly; but the details on which, in fact, our success will largely depend can only be

settled by experiment and experience. In our teaching in general, and especially in its sequence and grading, it is impossible to lay down hard and fast rules. We can see how Jesus adapted His educative work to individuals and to a particular environment. From Him we can learn something more than a broad outline of our task. We must follow Him in the spirit, and not necessarily in the letter, with a clear vision of our purpose and a sensitive elasticity of technique. For we, like our Master, have to deal with persons, not with types or averages, and must work by sympathy, not by rote.

Yet it is hardly realised how illuminating is the study of His teaching-method, or how appropriate it is to the problems with which we are concerned. To examine it will be to discover guidance not only as to the content of our teaching, but as to the order of its presentation.

We have hitherto hesitated to use the

example of Jesus, partly because we have not dared to realise that our task is the same as His and should therefore be done in His way, partly because we conclude that a mission to grown-up Jews of the first century can have little in common with teaching work among children of other races. He could assume familiarity with the Mosaic Law and the history of Israel, experience of worship both in the solemn festivals at the Temple and in the homelier atmosphere of the synagogue, and a tradition of religious privilege enforcing a high standard of disciplined conduct. Centuries of preparation as the "chosen people" and a well-marked racial type —these surely constitute special circumstances without which the whole presentation of the Gospel would be altered.

St. Paul at least did not think so. While fully admitting the advantage of the Jew, he felt himself able not only to proclaim Christ without insisting upon a

previous probation in Judaism, but to admit Gentiles to the Church on equal terms, and even to form Gentile Christian communities. It may be urged that these Gentiles were largely proselytes, and that, in any case, they adopted the Old Testament as a sacred book at an early date ; but in principle the Apostle's action shows that he did not regard the Jewish heritage as indispensable.

No one will be likely to question the peculiar fitness of the Jews or to doubt that their religious outlook and habits were of the greatest value to the early disciples. But if we examine more exactly what our Lord's Jewish hearers possessed we shall see that it represents, albeit in a highly developed and specialised form, elements which are, in fact, well-nigh universal. They belonged to a community with a definite character and conscious social life of its own ; every child is born into its particular social environment, more or

less highly organised. They had a strong and clear belief in the existence of God, a tradition of worship, and especially of the fear of the Lord ; this is an advanced stage of the simple awe and dread of the Holy which is common to primitive peoples and young children. They had a noble moral code expressed indeed mainly in prohibitions, but elaborate and faithfully observed ; widely as this differs in character from the taboos and discipline into which every child is initiated more or less consciously by its parents, the difference is one of degree more than of kind. There are in all human beings to a greater or less extent these three characteristics : we are all members of a society, family, tribe, clan, church ; we all respond to the influence of the numinous ; we all accept and obey certain rules and rituals. For the Jews these three had become precise and formulated through a long process of evolution in religious experience and practice.

We look back and see how wonderfully God had revealed Himself to the saints and sages of Israel and thankfully confess the world's gratitude for them. But in our Lord's time Judaism had become stereotyped and rigid; and it is evident that certain at least of its tendencies were hostile to the religion of Jesus. Evidently he found a richer response from the more childlike and unsophisticated of His contemporaries: it was the leaders of Judaism, Sadducees and Pharisees, whom He denounced and who crucified Him.

Making whatever allowance we may for the "advantage" of the Jew, it seems plain that in matters of essential principle those whom Jesus taught were not fundamentally different from our own pupils of to-day. British or Hindu, Baganda or Japanese, with each our mode of approach, will be adjusted to particular racial and personal qualities. They all, like the

disciples of Jesus, have in common certain broad human characteristics and needs: His example will supply us with the main lines of our task. As we trace the stages of His teaching we shall discover how easily it can be applied to our own circumstances and work.

Even when His method is applied not to adults, but to children, it seems still to supply a completely adequate guidance as to the order and grading of our teaching. Here, however, a point must be noted which will have to be remembered in all that follows. Jesus was concerned with adults, and His technique is adapted to them. Thus in applying it to children and adolescents we must make full allowance for the difference between the juvenile and the mature intelligence and response to tuition. It is abundantly plain that the old method of enforcing knowledge by much memorising of texts and collects, hymns, and catechisms too often produced

merely a repressed dislike of religion. Yet we must not on that account reject the necessity of discipline in the training of children or deny the value of learning by heart. The growing mind is able to assimilate knowledge in this way far more readily than in later life: it needs to discover the delight of duty, the worth of effort, the patience and concentration that come from hard work. The teacher will readily perceive when such discipline is producing a reaction of resentment. He will be careful not to make his lessons irksome. He will choose material vastly different from the traditional formulæ, which are repellent more because they are inappropriate and ill-graded than because they have to be committed to memory. But he will realise that he is dealing with the young and trying to equip them for full and useful lives, and that in doing so he cannot be casual and easy-going, or dispense with a certain hardness in his

demands upon their attention and powers. At each stage of the training which we are about to sketch it must be remembered that the lessons will require a technique adjusted to the age and development of the pupil, that children have to be helped to grow, not merely left to themselves, and that if the old-fashioned system erred in the direction of too little regard for the pupil's personality, certain modern theories err in the opposite direction by assuming that children grow best when freed from all control and allowed to learn only what they like.

B. The Teaching-Method of Jesus in its Earlier Stages

(1) Yet, whatever the age or condition of the disciple, the example of Jesus is appropriate; for his starting-point is always with that which His hearers already possess. Like every other educator, He must begin with what they can most readily understand. Taking the familiar idea of the Kingdom of God, or the honoured clauses of the Decalogue, He interprets them, filling the old with a fresh and positive significance, following up its implications to unrealised conclusions, correcting what is inadequate or inconsistent, revealing a content wider and richer than His hearers had imagined. He comes not to destroy but to fulfil—though in fulfilling He straightens out much that had been twisted and perverse and reaches results that appear to His critics revolutionary. Always His aim in this first

phase of His ministry is the same, to "set men's feet in a large room," to expand and enrich their idea of God, to widen and deepen their sympathies with mankind, to liberate from fears, to remove obsessions, to break down barriers by revealing life in all its fullness, life in the blessed community, life as the Father wills it.

This type of teaching, which is characteristic of the Galilean public ministry before the choosing of the Twelve, seems to have been addressed in the main to general audiences. An excellent example of its application to an individual is contained in the incident of the healing of the paralytic. The man was brought to Jesus with his disease intensified by a wrong conception of God—the old and terrible half-truth that God in His just anger was punishing sin by the infliction of suffering, that palsy was the proof of unforgiven wrong-doing and of the alienation of Jehovah. Jesus goes at once to the radical

error—the man's false notion of religion. "Child, your sins are forgiven" removes the obsession and prepares the way for "Arise and walk." Health whether of body or soul depends on faith, on a right relationship of confidence and conviction towards the Father who loves all His children, and whose will it is to seek and save those who are being lost. To have faith is to discover not only the real nature of God, but a true attitude both to material things and to humanity. It is to see all wealth as means to life in God, all truth as the knowledge of God, all effort as adventure for God, all mankind as God's family. If God is set in His due place as the sole centre of interest, all else takes its proper position within the circumference of a religious, unified, and ordered scheme.

It is very notable that Jesus does not primarily give instruction about God: dogmas and creeds are not in His method;

rather He seeks to stimulate interest, to widen vision, to convey experience. His utterances are sheer poetry; His illustrations perfect word-pictures. Much repetition has staled them for us; and the imagery of Palestine is not always our own. But if only we had the imagination to make our modern life glow, to see it and transfigure it as He did, God's Kingdom would inspire dreams, excite loyalty, kindle energy as it did of old.

Moreover, He corrects mistakes not by censure, or an elaborate analysis of error, or much talk about sin. The usual method of our evangelism, with its shattering emphasis upon corporate and personal guilt, is not drawn directly from Him. Always He reveals the best, leaving His hearers to discover how far they and their society fall short of it. Conviction of sin comes fast enough: but the sinner's cry, "Depart from me, for I am a sinful man" follows upon the revelation not of our

wickedness, but of the splendour of the Lord. Children whose youth has been clouded by morbid self-examination and terrorised by threats of Hell have not been to school with Jesus. There is warning, tremendous warning, on His lips for those who, "seeing the light, walk on in darkness." He is a realist, and knows the iniquity of mankind; but He reveals it always as a contrast to what God intends and makes possible, always so as to arouse desire for the better; and He directs His severity against the complacent and the self-righteous, not against the sensitive or the despairing. And always it is love that strikes, and strikes not for vengeance, but for cure.

Love, joy, peace, long-suffering—can anyone study the Sermon on the Mount and not feel that here is a summary of its contents—and not feel, too, that our religious teaching often lacks all or, if not all, at least the second of these qualities?

To kindle a passion for God, to make His righteousness attractive, to enlist in the joyous family of the Kingdom—this is His way; and all the dreams and hopes of childhood respond to Him.

(2) The second phase of His teaching is initiated by the selection of the Twelve and the development of the method of the parable. Those whose interest has been aroused are to be trained in spiritual sensitiveness, helped to become increasingly aware of God, to gain experience of communion with Him, and so to realise, not by precept, but by discovery and conviction, His nature and character. This must be by enlarging the circle of ideas associated with religion, by finding God in common things, by hallowing ever new spheres of daily life. All of us have at some time or another become vividly conscious of the mystery behind phenomena, have known times when some simple scene was irradiated by a light not of this earth,

have shared the insight of poets and mystics into the wonder and unity of the world. Our eyes have been opened and we have seen below the surface; and the occasion of our vision, the fact—be it sunset or flower, mother-love or friend—that accompanied the unveiling is thenceforth never wholly of the earth earthy; it reminds us of the eternal; it is hallowed.

Jesus continued His lessons in a series of simple and symbolic stories drawn from nature and the current doings of men, and expressing for those who can receive it the good news of God. It is a mistake to regard His parables as elaborate allegories appealing primarily to ingenuity of interpretation. He wants to infect men with the consciousness of God rather than to exercise their minds in thinking about God. His appeal is that of art, direct and immediate, more than of science or logic, though this does not mean that intellectual stimulus is not part of His purpose. He

would set religion in a new atmosphere; He would foster a new sense of the sanctity and oneness of the whole; He would relate the knowledge of God to daily tasks and daily contacts. It is a conversion, a change in the character and direction of His pupils' lives, that He desires. They must recapture the qualities of childhood, its simplicity and sincerity, its freedom and creativeness, its trust and gaiety; and they will do so as God permeates and unifies their experience, leaving no room for mixed motives, for lies and lusts and fears and pride. Let them see God and every common bush will be ablaze for them: life will be full of zest and romance, tense with effort and suffering, elate with the liberty of joyful service.

The most obvious quality of His technique is its complete freedom from all tendency to dictate or indoctrinate. He provokes curiosity, elicits discoveries, opens up enquiries; but He lets His hearers

form their own conclusions: "he that hath ears to hear, let him hear"—was there ever such trust in the faculties of mankind, such respect for their personalities, such patience in allowing misunderstanding? He will explain, if they ask; He will follow up what they have gained; He will balance one lesson with another. But it is their growth, not His power to impress Himself upon them, that matters: better no discipleship than a forced compliance and an inward rebellion. Love will win in the long run; but first it must suffer many things, even contempt and rejection: it will win by its own inherent worth of beauty and truth, and He will trust it to death and beyond. Hence His freedom from the desire for quick returns, for a high statistical percentage of successes, for the easy attainment of a recognised standard. There is no need for coercion or prizes if the teacher loves enough and wisely. For those who have

learnt the lesson know that it is its own reward and beyond price, the supreme means and end of life.

Of its worth He gives them opportunity to make tests for themselves. Early in their training He sends the Twelve on a mission to go and proclaim what they have learnt, and so to discover its practical value, and fix their own appreciation of it. They are to go almost at random, to the the first house they find, sure that their message is for everyone, and not selecting only a few choice spirits as their audience. Nor is there need of elaborate preparation : the good news is simple, and their personalities and conviction will convey it better than argument. If they will "let their light shine before men," then men will arise and glorify God ; for they will catch and reflect the light. So He helps them to develop initiative and a sense of responsibility, saving them from the risk of taking His conclusions at second-hand

and enabling them to verify the truth of His teaching for themselves. And they returned with joy, the joy of confirmed vision, of tested experience, of rendered service.

Here, then, is the second phase for us. We are to help our pupils to grow by increasing their knowledge of God's reality, by extending their perception of the religious meaning of life and its activities, and by fostering the appropriate expression of religion in conduct. How far the actual parables used by Jesus will themselves serve this end may be doubted: sowers and fishermen are not familiar to the dwellers in cities. But the method is plain; and we have history and daily life to furnish us with examples. The activities of the school, the science lessons, the games, the routine of every day would furnish us with parables in plenty; if Jesus could use a speculator in hidden treasure or a fraudulent steward as

material, we need call nothing unclean. Our object is to bring out the religious worth and meaning of simple current events, in order to foster a more sensitive awareness of God and a more consistent relationship with Him. To know about Him is not necessarily to know Him ; the latter should accompany, if not precede, the former. Religion should be co-extensive with life : too often it is a compartment within it. How vast a change would take place in our teaching if, with boys and girls of eight to twelve years, we substituted parables for catechisms, " projects " for formulæ.

(3) So far in the teaching-method of Jesus there has been no question raised as to His own position or claim. He has been " the Teacher," the Son of Man, whose authority and originality have been instinctively recognised, and over whom the Jewish authorities have held enquiry. He has become intimately known to His

disciples by close and continuous intercourse during many months of shared journeys. But, though He has entered into and altered their outlook and way of life, He has made no specific allusion to what is usually meant by His divinity. "Who, then, is this?" So they had questioned among themselves: and the question for us, as for them, is bound to arise. But it is not till the great day at Cæsarea Philippi that He Himself confronts them with it, and receives from St. Peter the confession of His Messiahship.

We have already urged that this "acknowledgment of God in Christ" is not only essential to Christianity, but in the process of Christian education supplies the motive necessary to a full growth and integration in the pupil. But its place in that process is worth attention, as well as the fact that the creed is elicited, not imposed.

Evidently to His disciples Jesus first presents Himself in His manhood : evidently, too, Jewish prejudice may well have delayed the recognition of His divinity ; for to a Jew the mere suggestion was blasphemy. But while we may well suggest to our pupils that He is uniquely divine, there seems very strong support for letting them become familiar with Him as a character in history, as the supreme poet and teacher and hero, before they encounter theological definitions of His relationship with God. There is real danger, if the supernatural and miraculous elements of His life be prematurely or unduly stressed, that He will appear numinous indeed, but mythical, a Being from another world whose nature is wholly unlike theirs and whom it is impossible to imitate, or even, since He is totally different from them, to understand. If they can be helped to discover His divinity rather in His character than in His birth,

in His love more than His powers, this will surely be all gain. We believe that familiarity with His story, education along His lines and consequent appreciation of His uniqueness, will of itself and without dogmatic teaching lead inevitably to the discovery that "never man spake as this man," and so to the confession "My Lord and my God." Such confession, thus proceeding from conviction and personal knowledge, will for us, as for the disciples, involve the experience of seeing Him transfigured and divine, and so of finding out the meaning and necessity of theological definitions. Creeds only repel when they are professed conventionally and without sincere acceptance, professed as a mere form taken on trust, but not yet justified by any acquaintance at first hand with the facts on which they are based. For the Church which has known and tested the saving power of the risen Christ it is inevitable to proclaim Him Son of

God; its members, as they share in the effects of His power, will share in the certainty of His Godhead. It is educationally and psychologically a mistake to insist upon confession before there has been any opportunity of finding out the experience that underlies it. And such insistence is to a large extent responsible for the existence of unconverted church-members and for the relapse of many who come to regard their membership as insincere.

NOTE.—The three phases thus summarised correspond to the following sections in St. Mark's Gospel: (1) to chaps. i-iii. 6; (2) to chaps. iii. 7–viii. 26; (3) to chaps. viii. 27–ix. 8. I believe that the bulk of the teaching contained in Matt. v.–vii. belongs to (1).

C. The Application of His Method to Pre-Adolescent Education

Although this teaching was given in the first instance to adults, it is also singularly appropriate for children. Taking the three stages as constituting the programme for training up to adolescence, it would seem clear that we have three well-marked periods to which to assign them.

(1) In childhood and until about their eighth year[1] our pupils are more powerfully influenced by "suggestion" and atmosphere than by formal teaching. Modern psychology bears out the conclusions of experience that in these years the foundations of character are laid so securely as to be almost unalterable later. Mistakes resulting in partial or even complete "dissociation," in psychic wounds and the formation of complexes, can

[1] Age in years does not always harmonise with development. These dates are approximate.

usually be traced to this period. And, on the other hand, habits then formed, rather by imitation than by choice, maintain a hold upon the personality which can scarcely be loosened even if consciously repudiated. No years are so formative; in none is the need for an environment of love and high purpose so essential. Many a teacher spends time and effort in the almost hopeless task of repairing damage caused by thoughtless parents or nurses; much of the Church's failure is due to the home rather than to the school.

We shall refer to this matter when we discuss the scope of religious education; for the assistance and training of parents should be a first charge upon the activities of the Church. Meanwhile, we would urge that religion in these early years should reproduce something of the character of the Sermon on the Mount. Children should discover in their own social circle a community where love and

joy, peace and long-suffering, are the characteristic temper, where criticism of others is friendly, comradeship between old and young is natural, delight in beauty, sincerity in answering questions, and joy in the exercise of healthy faculties can be taken for granted—above all, where God is obviously and spontaneously recognised and worshipped. Their native sense of wonder should be encouraged and trained from the time when the parents pray beside the cot till the child itself is able to " talk to God " and enjoy simple services of praise. Discipline should be rather positive than negative, the setting of high standards by the contagion of example rather than the enforcement of prohibitions, a necessary expression of love, not of unintelligible caprice. If the child grows up finding religion in its home not as an external obligation, but as the source of that home's joy and security, the breach between Christianity and life will

never occur; and if, as soon as its education in the more limited sense begins, it is helped to see that this joy and security is part of a general outlook of which Jesus is the perfect example, it will take its lessons as a natural and further development of a discipline and social life shot through with wonder and love. We set before ourselves the ideal of a childhood in which religion is not only a duty, but a delight, since it is based not upon fear and repression, but upon trust and the exercise of every healthy faculty.

If it is urged that this presupposes a home-life of a quality seldom found even among Christians, we shall admit that the parents are in large measure the key to the whole situation. But we shall urge that in almost every home, Christian or non-Christian, there are elements of vital religion; and that upon these the teacher should begin to work. Let him not think that if the home is pagan he has, therefore,

to start either with a blank sheet, or with the condemnation and erasure of what is already written. In every young child he will find elements of worth. There may have been no acknowledged worship ; there will still be a desire for it, more or less distorted or inhibited, but capable of being refined or released. There may be bad habits of suspicion of others, of snobbishness, of timidity or naughtiness ; they are not yet ingrained, though unintelligent punishment or censure may make them so ; they are curable by patience and encouragement. There may have been a wrong sort of discipline, and children either " spoilt " and uncontrolled or broken and resentful ; the desire for order and fair play, for sensible guidance and scope to use its powers, is still there, and can be re-directed. The test of a teacher or an educational system is not in the ability to produce brilliance, but to correct mistakes of inheritance and

infancy; its handling of its difficult cases is the true criterion of a school's worth. Faith in the attractiveness of God is the right expression of belief in His power.

Let the teacher's first task be to make education and religion joyous—which does not mean casual or easy or amusing. Jesus made His hearers feel that life was worth while—grander, richer, nobler than they knew. Those rejected Him who had lost the power of dreaming. All children will respond if their imaginations are caught by stories which they can visualise, and even enact dramatically. Such stories may be drawn from the Old Testament or great myths like the *Pilgrim's Progress*, if care is taken in their selection. But Jesus Himself should be the chief subject of them, Jesus in the days of His flesh, Jesus in the simple scenes of His Galilean ministry; the object being rather to familiarise them with the sense of His

presence and character than to demonstrate His Godhead or to inculcate doctrinal principles. All children will learn easily and gladly if what they learn attracts them and is taught in an atmosphere of trust.

(2) About their ninth year children pass gradually into another phase where suggestion gives way to more direct teaching in reply to the child's increasing curiosity and independence. Story-telling ceases to be suitable; for the imagination is no longer untrammelled by criticism or untested by experience. The child is becoming a practical person who strives to relate its ideas to the real world and to discover how things work and what they mean. Hitherto myth and history, fairy-tale and fact, have been happily blended: now they begin to be distinguished, often very sharply.

This is the time, then, at which parables or projects should be introduced, and

religion linked up with actual and daily doings. The method of God's activity in relation to nature and to mankind can be illustrated and explained; the wonder-lands of science and of history are becoming intelligible; real life, real happenings, take the place of the fanciful and the legendary. As questions arise they must be honestly answered; to shirk the issue or to evade it is to provoke distrust or to foster disillusionment. Children will be satisfied if the answer is sincere, even if they cannot wholly understand it; they are quick to notice when they are being "put off" or played with. For the same reason they may be encouraged to hard and definite work if they are helped to feel the importance of it. To treat religion as a "soft" or voluntary subject often does more harm than the strictest insistence upon lessons: in making our teaching attractive we must not give the impression that this subject matters less

or is less exacting than history or mathematics.

Interest should centre upon the life and work of Jesus, presented not now as mere story, but in relation to its background and purpose, and so far as possible in its sequence. If children can be helped to see why certain events took place and what were the issues at stake, they will feel the actuality and the appropriateness to themselves of His ministry. In His character it is especially the heroic aspect that will appeal. He is still the friend and the poet and the healer; but now He is also the lonely captain, choosing His way and following it with unfaltering fortitude, counting the cost and paying it to the uttermost. All the native hero-worship which is the first flowering of a child's affection should be fixed upon Him, as the supreme figure in human history, the one perfect Son of Man. If this is to be assisted, the teacher must avoid

over-emphasising the miraculous : the child is just discovering doubts about magic wands and caps of darkness, and will have difficulty in understanding the difference between the supernatural and the imaginary. On the other hand, it is becoming conscious of its own powers and will readily accept the power of Jesus, provided this is presented rather as the expression of His supreme character than as a non-natural and inexplicable gift.

The problem of the type of worship best suited to this period is a difficult one. The simple and atmospheric service is no longer sufficient ; for questions are arising, and " childish " forms of hymn and prayer will be liable to repel. But adult services are even more unsatisfactory : children at this age are restless, and cannot sit through long sermons or share in long prayers without strain, boredom, and resentment. Dignity, variety, action, and a restrained ceremonial would seem to be

required; and the subjects of prayer and address should be closely related to the child's life and experience, but expressed in language which does not "talk down" to its supposed level.

(3) In the third phase, from twelve to fifteen, we have again well-marked changes. The age of puberty varies so greatly in different individuals, and still more so under different climates and in different races, that the time of early adolescence cannot be fixed more closely than this. Suffice it that this phase represents the beginning of pubescence when the pupils begin to "put away childish things," and the method suggested for it in religious education must not be begun except in relation to the development of the scholars. What would be appropriate in southern countries at twelve would be generally unsuitable till fourteen in the north.

We have now a period of uneven growth,

of rapid but spasmodic change, of unsettlement, of struggle, and often of acute difficulty. Self-consciousness, the result of a contrast between awakening powers and a physical and mental instrument as yet unequal to them, and of the consequent sense of thwarted wishes, of awkwardness and failure of control, is almost universal. The muscles develop beyond the capacity for endurance; the intellect is quickened, but not yet balanced by knowledge; the will gains independence, as docility disappears; but its use is still unstable, and its objects change with a disconcerting speed and are often unattainable; conscience becomes sensitive, and with it an interest in religion that may easily take a morbid and introspective form. The child, in fact, finds itself faced with the intractability of the real world, with limitations and weaknesses which it no longer accepts without conflict, with doubts about itself and about life which

were before mere subjects of curiosity but are now vital matters of acute personal interest. It has to begin to " range itself," to find its place in a sphere unexpectedly perverse.

Hence it develops a protective conventionality, is miserable if it is not " one of a crowd," seeks for a group in which to escape from its self-consciousness and to evade its increasing sense of individuality. Beneath the herd-behaviour there is the urge towards self-realisation ; and when alone the adolescent is often passing through times of distress, fluctuating between extravagant egoism and extravagant self-distrust. But the struggle, though often apparent, is scrupulously concealed ; the inner life becomes a jealously guarded secret.

It must not be thought that the phase is one of relapse or, from the teacher's point of view, of disappointment. Rather it is one of supreme importance and interest.

The child is becoming a person, and, if the help that can be given seems less direct and demands closer sympathy and tact, it is not on that account less real. It should be sheer joy to watch the tentative signs of character emerging, to wait for moments of confidence, and in them to encourage and forewarn. The adolescent should discover that his teacher understands and rejoices in the fresh powers and possibilities, that he wants the challenge of life to be taken up, and that now they are friends in a deeper sense, since the pupil is graduating in the school of manhood. The teacher should realise that his pupil is passing through a time of difficulty, is sensitive and easily wounded by ridicule, and resents alike neglect and obtrusiveness; that patience and respect for individuality and a willingness to stay in the background are essential, but that he can, when the opportunity comes, exert an influence all the more valuable because

now deliberately desired. It is this phase which, above all, tests the teacher's quality. It is easy to impose himself upon the affections of his charge, to make himself the centre of a sentimental attachment, and to weaken the child's growth by fostering habits of dependence. It is even easier to be rebuffed by shyness, to resent the new secrecy and independence, and to allow a sense of irritation to destroy all prospects of mutual confidence. To let the child seek a far country for itself, to watch its mistakes, and yet to be ready to welcome it whenever it desires to return, helping it silently and without recognition, this is difficult—and godlike.

The characteristic psychology of the period determines the type of religious education during it. If fancy and fact have been the dominant notes of the earlier phases, the interest now shifts from facts to persons. Events and great deeds hitherto enjoyed and dramatically

re-enacted now become less absorbing than the characters of the actors in them. Admiration and an objective hero-worship develop into devotion and an intense personal relationship. The child, outwardly conventional, inwardly lonely and self-conscious, finds solace in the struggles and triumphs of its "idol," regarding him no longer as an example, but as a comrade.

Here, then, is where the "person" of Jesus, rather than His words and actions, will become real; and attention may well be fixed upon it. Experience of His power to sustain and "save" will spring out of the deepened needs of adolescence. "Now I know for myself" should take the place of "I have heard that it was said." This means for the child, as for the disciples, the discovery of the data for a confession of the divinity of the Lord. The religious awakening coinciding with a fresh understanding of Him should lead naturally to the recognition

of His Godhead and the vision of Him transfigured.

Otherwise religious teaching should now be mainly biographical. The records of the Old Testament regarded as studies in the preparation of individuals and a nation for the full gift of Christ; stories of the lives and work of Christian saints, missionaries, and prophets; and in particular a sympathetic account of the history of St. Paul—not a mere memorising of his journeys, but an explanation of his character and development—will provide material for lessons. But everything should be regarded as secondary to and explanatory of Christ—His predecessors as reaching out imperfectly to what was revealed fully in Him, His followers as illustrating His influence on men and women of after-days. Modern examples should be included, in order that the pupils may realise the present significance not less than the past achievements

of the faith. Doctrine and any abstract treatment of the subject should still be avoided ; they will come later ; this is the age of experience rather than of explanation. Let the adolescent " fall in love " with Christ with that utterly sexless and utterly beautiful devotion of which we are all for that little season capable. The intellectual and moral justification of his loyalty will then be possible in the years between puberty and maturity.

Worship during adolescence raises difficulties not less evident than those in other aspects of tuition at this stage. The adolescent is capable of longer and more regular services than the child, but he wants to take some initiative, to be more than a mere passive listener. Compulsory attendance, unless his interest is aroused, will almost certainly be disastrous : he will accept it as a habit imposed by rule, will attend for conformity's sake, but will form a solid bias against it which will show

itself as soon as compulsion is relaxed. It is plain that in the whole matter of children's services there is room for free and careful experiment; rather let a child stay away than be forced to something that bores; but children enjoy "church" if they are interested, and particularly the adolescent will appreciate it. There is much to be said for a service in which the control is in the hands of young people; they can be helped with the forms of prayer, with the choice and ordering of the several elements in it; but, if they feel responsibility for it and take a real part in it, they will regard it in a wholly new and desirable light. A "Children's Church" is a possibility that should be attempted and encouraged.

D. The Teaching-Method of Jesus in its Later Phases, and its Application in Education

(1) The Confession of St. Peter marks the critical turning-point not only in the events of the ministry of Jesus, but in the mode of His teaching. As He "sets His face to go up to Jerusalem," so He undertakes with His disciples a fresh and threefold task. In a sense these three aspects reproduce the three phases already discussed. At the beginning He had to expand and enrich their sensitiveness towards God, to relate this sense of God to common life, and to help them to fix it by discovering its fullness personified in Himself. Now He has to familiarise them with the significance of their confession of Him, helping them to understand His nature and share His values; then to teach them to discover the implications of their confession in a revised outlook upon life and

conduct; and finally to consummate His lessons in a final and representative act which shall draw all the rest to a focusing-point. God, God manifested in the world, God in Christ—these correspond closely with Christ, Christ manifested in the world, Christ crucified.

It is noticeable that, whereas the earlier teaching falls into three well-marked grades, there is no such clear gradation in the second sequence. In the last months of His ministry He is enabling His disciples to correct preconceived and mistaken views of Himself by showing them His standards of value, His demands upon mankind, His way of life, and by pointing forward to the Cross. He uses all methods: direct teaching—"the Son of Man must suffer," "let Him take up His cross daily"; parables, whether revealing His own nature, like the Good Samaritan, or His place in history, like the Wicked Husbandmen, or the Christian's responsibility, like

the Unjust Steward and the Rich Man and Lazarus ; apocalyptic discourses giving an unequalled sense of the immediacy of the spiritual and the tremendous issues involved in a Christian view of the universe ; discussion, like His questioning with St. Peter or the Sons of Zebedee, and with the Pharisees and Sadducees ; action, like His Entry into Jerusalem or His Last Supper. It is evidently neither possible nor desirable to disentangle these or attempt to set them out in a sequence. All are elements in an educational process which has indeed a single aim, the disclosing of the true meaning of Christianity, the interpretation and imparting of that for which the Cross is the adequate symbol. We may conveniently amplify the three aspects of the teaching in different paragraphs : as a process of education they will be used simultaneously.

(*a*) Confessing Him to be the Christ, St. Peter had immediately repudiated for Jesus the possibility of rejection and death.

It is easy for us to marvel at his blindness : it is less easy not to share it. He, like ourselves, had been dazed by the grandeur of what he had discovered. How could he associate it with suffering and the contempt of others ? Surely it must win its way to immediate and universal acceptance, to success and an earthly triumph. To reconcile the known majesty of God, emphasised alike by tradition and by experience, with a life of service among men was hard enough : it had needed months of training and intercourse to convince him that the Man of Nazareth was the Christ of God. To believe that this service and humiliation was not simply a rôle to be discarded at will, a chrysalis-phase from which a glory of wings would speedily burst forth, was at present impossible. This could not be the real status and equipment of the Messiah, nor the sum of His achievement. All the centuries which had proclaimed Him a King, conquering and to

conquer, all the hopes of world-dominion cherished through generations of oppression, all the ambitions for personal reward in His Kingdom rose in revolt against a prospect so contrary to earthly ideas of sovereignty. Jesus had a long and, until Calvary, a seemingly hopeless task in striving to transform the accepted notions of Godhead, of power and creativeness, to persuade His followers that if He were Christ He was also servant of all, and King by virtue only of love and much giving.

He will not abrogate His claim. The question put to St. Peter is put again and again in one form or another, that men may discover His true claim upon them. But as Messiah He must remodel their whole conception of God and of the qualities that they reckon godlike. There must be no contrast between the gentleness of the Son and the justice of the Father, between humility and might, love and

power. It is His character, His way of living, that is God's character and way. The old metaphors based upon the sultans and satraps, the armies and wealth, of this world must be replaced by a wholly different imagery. God is God, not because He is different from the Son of Man—as Jew and Greek alike maintained; but precisely in His identity with the quality and attributes of Jesus. The disciples only learned the lesson at Calvary: the Church, early infected by deistic and philosophic ideas of the contrast between God and man, has seldom dared to accept it.

(*b*) The character of God, as this is seen in Jesus, is illustrated in the new type of parable which this phase of the teaching develops. Hitherto a series of simple human doings had been used to illustrate aspects of God's Kingdom, modes of His activity, the reality of His presence. Now more elaborate and dramatic stories reveal

His character. He seeks and cares for the wounded; He welcomes back the wanderers; He invites all mankind to His presence; He trusts His servants, and rewards those who respond by the gift of fuller opportunities of service; He woos the allegiance of the workers in His world and bestows upon them all the same recompense; He makes plain the urgency of their tasks, and appeals for utter consecration in their fulfilment of them. It is not enough to see God unveiled in the mystery of daily life: we are to know what part to take in it and how to co-operate with Him in its discharge. Thus all our ideas of personal and social conduct are to be reviewed in the light of Christ, and all our activities brought into harmony with His nature.

It is obvious that Jesus now intensifies His demand upon His followers in proportion to their growth and fuller experience.

It is not enough for them to see and enjoy God, they must serve and suffer with Him. Joy is not simply a child-like acceptance and wonder, a passive contemplation of the presence of the Kingdom. It is an active partnership in redemptive effort, an energy of tense and urgent consecration; there is pain in it, and uttermost agony without which joy would be incomplete.

At a time when quietism and a fatalistic resignation to God's will or else a regulated and exact obedience to His law dominated religion, Jesus called men not to quiet, but to adventure, not to the discharge of duties, but to the incurring of risks. They must work hard like the recipients of the talents; they must use prudence and thought like the unjust steward; they must be quick to find and seize opportunities like the wise virgins; they must let no other pretext come between them and their response like

the guests at the great supper. It is a life of ardour worthy of a supreme call that He puts before them—an ardour undeterred by fears and regardless of consequences.

In the same connection and to enforce this sense of the momentous issues at stake, He uses the imagery of the Apocalyptists. Such language had been employed in times of depression to arouse men out of acquiescence in evil, to fill them with conviction of the energies and resources of God, to create a vision of the tremendous and romantic possibilities of life. Many of us have discovered that in the great crises of our growth, in the presence of an overwhelming spiritual experience, the only appropriate language is that which speaks of shaken heavens, and falling stars, and darkness, and the coming of the Son of Man, and a great day of the Lord. To take such a discourse as that in Mark xiii. as a literal prediction

of actual future events is to misunderstand its character; rather it is an account of such events as they appear to those who have been set free from the belief that the material is alone the real, who have felt the shattering grandeur of God, and who see His coming as an event far more august than any earthly phenomenon. For them the idea that Jesus was referring to His own literal reappearance in a material setting will seem prosaic and vulgar: He describes far more actual, far more terrible things than the *dies iræ*, and they are things within the experience of the spiritually sensitive. For the Christian, life here and now is, or should be, apocalyptic.

(*c*) These two aspects of His teaching are preparatory to, and coloured by, the third. It is in the Cross that they reach their climax—that the standards of Jesus, in their contrast with those of the world and in their power to triumph and transform,

are clearly displayed. It is not our task here to attempt the exposition of the mystery upon which Christian devotion has fastened throughout the ages, or to show how it reveals at once man's manifold failure and God's universal remedy. To see it as something done for us, to share it as something done in us, to let the quality of Christ manifested by it infect our lives, to model ourselves after that pattern—this is to find our education complete. And as yet the best of us is a beginner. We cannot reproduce in our teaching the fellowship of the mystery; we cannot, if we are true to our calling, minimise its significance or encourage our pupils to think that they can evade it.

For this phase of growth the material supplied by the Synoptists should lead on to the fuller and more developed ideas contained in the Fourth Gospel. Here we have the complete portrait of Jesus

set out not as a history, but in a series of scenes chosen so as to illuminate His significance, and rich in revelation of His character and message. St. John should supply the chief material for the training of the later stages of discipleship : in these days, when the whole trend of religious thought is towards a distinctly Johannine theology, no pupil of the post-adolescent age should be allowed to finish his time at school without a thorough study of this Gospel. It is not " milk for babes," despite its wonderful simplicity of style ; but, as an inspired presentation of " the measure of the stature of the fullness of Christ," it stands alone. And its contents, fitting in as they do with these later periods of the Synoptic record, give us material of paramount importance. Nowhere is the relationship of Jesus to the Father, the way of love, and the supremacy of sacrifice more triumphantly shown.

(2) This threefold aspect of the later teaching of Jesus has its appropriateness to the period from adolescence onward. Hitherto we have been concerned to avoid all systematic or formal teaching of doctrine or ethics, to let the character of Jesus illuminate the circumstances, aspirations, and conduct of the children, but not to intrude anything of a secondary or derivative kind. Now our pupils are in the midst of their effort to adjust themselves to life; and a coherent philosophy, however untechnical, a consistent ideal, and a clear objective become essential to their development. Physically and mentally the phase of uneven and inharmonious growth is giving place to the formation of an integrated and settled character. Gradually, or sometimes suddenly, the fret and conflict of puberty passes away: the youth has taken the measure of his powers and his environment, "finds himself," and becomes a man. When attained rapidly,

this change may take the form to which the term conversion in its usual sense is properly applied. An experience of Christ or of God, or sometimes of some other being or person, externalised with overwhelming vividness, breaks in upon him, and transforms almost in a flash his whole centre of interest: before there was conscious discord and life was a tangle of confused motives and impulses; now all is ordered, concentrated, unified in an harmonious pattern. In other and perhaps more numerous cases there is no one moment of complete change: growth is slower and free from violent upheavals; the character settles into an integrated whole without perceptible conversion. Probably we ought to realise that the difference of type is less complete than is supposed; that in each a real and definite co-ordination of interests is taking place; and that the suddenness of violent conversions is often more apparent than real, having been, in fact, preceded by

a long period of movement often repressed or unrecognised, and followed by a similar period in which the effects of the great moment are worked out into a coherent outlook. Those whose religious training has been continuous and sound are certainly by no means more likely than others to experience an instantaneous conversion, though there will normally come a time of decision and surrender. To regard such conversions as a proof of spirituality is wholly mistaken—rather they are due to intense inward conflict suddenly resolved, and this may well have arisen from a bad training in religion, an hypochondriacal sense of sin, or fear of God and subconscious rebellion against Him. Many psychologists would use the term conversion to cover the whole process of ranging oneself, and would regard a catastrophic change as, if not pathological, at least indicative of a previous morbid psychosis.

Clearly, religious education should aim not at inducing emotional upheaval, but at the steady development of a God-centred outlook and way of life. Sentimentality should not be encouraged; worship may, with advantage, be simple and austere; and anything sensuous must be carefully watched. Experienced teachers know well that at this period of developing sexual life when control is not yet strong and passion is easily aroused, any strong excitement, however religious in origin, may have deplorable reactions. This does not mean that emotion should be repressed—to do so is to drive it underground; it needs an outlet; but the teacher will seek sane and normal means for its expression, and in religion will combine it rather with active efforts in social or missionary service than with forms of worship.

(*a*) Intellectually this is the period when specific teaching in elementary theology and the outlines of doctrine may be

profitably given, though still by methods of induction from the evidence, not of dictation or as conclusions which must be accepted as unintelligible but authoritative. Those who have found a real experience of Jesus will naturally have to review their conceptions of Him. "Whose Son is He?" becomes a matter of importance; and, if the Son of God, then what does this imply in relation to nature and mankind? The problems of evil and pain, of the purpose of the universe, of human destiny, these will not yet be formulated clearly, but they will be stirring yeastily within the mind; and, if expressed, must be dealt with sincerely: youth, while testing its first steps in adult life, is quick to observe what is real, but, unless it relies implicitly on its guide, will take nothing on bare authority.

Pupils should at this stage be definitely encouraged to scrutinise and cross-examine the grounds of their belief, to correct earlier

misunderstandings, to face honest doubts, to search for explanations for themselves. Their minds are surely meant to be exercised about religion, not to lie fallow with regard to it. Indeed, it is almost criminal for the teacher to expect his class to accept his results " on trust." It is far better that they should challenge orthodox traditions than that they should swallow them without interest or understanding : there is a time when the nestling bird holds up an open mouth and waits for the delivery of food into it ; later on it must hop about and forage for itself, even at the risk of hunger or indigestion.

(*b*) Further, they should now be introduced to a study of the relation of Christianity to problems of personal conduct, of social reconstruction, and of international contacts, as matters both of enquiry and, so far as circumstances permit, of practical experiment. To see the Christian gospel in action and to share, however slightly, in

its service will make a far deeper impression than reading or class-work or sermons, if these have no bearing upon any first-hand knowledge. It is during this period that class-consciousness and racial antipathies become fixed ; and it is, therefore, of the highest importance that the programme of education should include opportunities for friendly intercourse with those who will otherwise be represented in caricature. However sympathetic the teaching on social and missionary work, it may well fail to break down the sense of separation and unconscious habits of patronage or resentment unless it is supported by experience of those with whom it deals.

Now, too, is the time when the co-operation of teachers in other subjects is essential. The pupils necessarily specialise, and begin to fit themselves for a particular trade or profession. They have their own talents to use, their own responsibility to

parents, fellow-citizens, and the world. If they are encouraged to make their own success or the honour of the school or the gratification of their relatives the sole aim of their efforts, the true purpose of education will be frustrated. Let them put their whole strength into their own tasks and concentrate attention upon them ; that is necessary and right. But let them recognise, both by repeated assurance and by being shown how their work helps forward the general good, that they have in their own subject a vocation, and in it are serving not their own advantage only, but God and the community. It has been truly said that the religion of a lorry-driver shows itself not in the number of his attendances at church, but in the skill and care with which he drives ; and the pupil studying chemistry, or geometry, or Greek irregular verbs, or carpentry, or gymnastics should be able, without pietism or priggishness, to " do all to the glory of God." Only

his teachers must help him. If they try to turn him into a bit of machinery or a mere collector of technical information, or if they use competition, and prizes or punishments, as the sole stimulus to effort, they will be deliberately betraying their highest charge. Work is service. Later on, it must be confessed, the adult will discover that certain spheres of work are hard to justify, and that under existing conditions others, in themselves useful, are so ordered as to serve no obviously social or religious end. But at school every item in the curriculum is capable of being given a religious background. The future agricultural labourer, not less than the embryo professor of mathematics, can pursue his training all the better if he sees himself as one of a world-wide partnership of effort, a citizen of the Kingdom of God.

(*c*) Finally, during this period there should be some occasion for definite and

critical consecration of life, when the youth is brought to a test and, if desirous of it, is initiated into full and confessed discipleship. It falls outside our scope to discuss at length the arguments in favour of the various ages suggested for Confirmation or admission to the Church. Much depends upon what is involved in the rite—whether it be viewed mainly as a means for the imparting and reception of special grace and help from God or as an offering by the candidate of himself to a life of loyalty and service. In the former case an early age has much to recommend it; but, if it be adopted, then some further ceremony after the period of puberty should supplement it. In the latter case there is much to be said for a date definitely later than that usually chosen, and associated either with leaving school or with the entrance into manhood or womanhood, a date at which convictions can be regarded as reasonably secure. But individual temperament,

racial characteristics, social customs, and economic circumstances differ so widely that the question cannot be given a single answer.

It is obvious that such a consecration should be regarded as a matter of supreme importance, that any tendency to treat it as a formality will only produce insincerity, and that the greatest care should be taken not only in the preparation for it, but in the encouragement and assistance of those who have received it. Far too often the rite comes as a climax, arouses intense aspiration in the recipient, but is treated by teachers and fellow-Christians as final or as in itself sufficient to secure a life of devotion—a revolution without a morrow. To let the whole matter drop afterwards or to assume that now all will be well is to make it almost certain that the natural reaction from a time of strain will overthrow the good that has been done. To awaken resolve and then to provide no scope for

its fulfilment is thoughtless and cruel. The rite should at once lead on not only to opportunities of worship, but to means of service, to a Pentecost of Christian fellowship.

THE SCOPE OF RELIGIOUS EDUCATION

VI

THE SCOPE OF RELIGIOUS EDUCATION

If the aim of religious education be fullness of growth in God, its scope cannot be confined to schools and colleges, or to the teaching profession. We have already seen that the home is intimately and vitally concerned with it; that the organised Church has a large part to play; and that education must continue beyond school-days. In fact, of course, education is a life-long process, and the chief function of religious institutions is teaching. "Go and teach, or make learners of, all nations," did not mean solely, "Go and set up schools."

Yet the chief obstacle to securing a true conception and an adequate practice of

religious education has undoubtedly been the failure of church-members to realise the full significance of their function as a teaching body. Rightly regarded, the provision of opportunities for worship, the ministry of word and sacraments, the work of evangelism, of social service, of medical missions, are not only of educational value, but are actually teaching, since they enable the individual influenced by them to become the sort of person whom God wills him to be. Yet too often these have been treated as separate departments, differing from, and contrasted with, educational activities.

In part this is due to the same specialising and sectionalising tendency which we have seen to be characteristic of our age, with its widened range of activities and administrative efficiency. It is convenient to divide a great piece of work into departments and organise each independently; and the liaison between them is apt to

grow weak, and, as it weakens, to leave a sense of rivalry. In part it arises from the narrow concept of education as concerned only with the young, and only with their intellectual training. This has led to a certain contempt for it as lower and more mundane than the "spiritual" activities of the priest, the preacher, or the evangelist. But chiefly it must be ascribed to the restricted understanding of religion, which has too often been regarded as a static condition rather than a growing relationship, as the discharge of duties or as membership in a society more than the continuous and progressive attainment of union with God. Hence education, which should be co-extensive with life, has been confined to the preparation for conversion or for maturity.

The result of this failure on the part of organised religion is seen in the disastrous leakage that is reported in all denominations between the close of the "school

age" and adult church-membership, in the fixed and unprogressive outlook of many Christians whose faith has taken a final shape at adolescence, and in the consequent establishment of a vicious circle, since young children must depend on their parents for Christian upbringing during the critical period of their earliest years, and parents cannot supply what is required unless they themselves are learning fresh knowledge of God. Psychology has demonstrated that we are all liable to the fixation of juvenile ideas and the inability to grow out of juvenile states of mind. It is abundantly obvious to any candid enquirer that the "moron," or undeveloped childish type, is more frequent in religion than in any other branch of human activity. Prayers learned in babyhood and totally unsuited to a full-grown faith; habits appropriate in extreme youth but meaningless later; ideas of God wholly inconsistent with an adult outlook and

experience; formulæ once vivid but now stereotyped and irrational—all these persist for many of us and do duty for our religious equipment. The results of such fixations are inevitable: either religion, associated solely with "childish things," is put away with them when manhood or womanhood is attained; or it survives embodied in a rigid and atrophied framework, and renders its possessor dogmatic in rejecting every new discovery, zealous in protecting his idol, and constrained to maintain at all costs the distinction between his immutable and unreasonable "faith" and his ordinary and secular intelligence. If proof were needed of the extent and of the remedy of this evil, it can be found, not merely in such investigations as were undertaken in Britain during the war into the religious outlook of the soldiery, but in the contrast between the personnel of the younger Churches, where religious education is continued in later

life, and that of the older and "home" Churches, where little attention is paid to teaching after adolescence. The recent movements to revive the teaching office of the Church, to give evangelism the form of the teaching-mission, and to organise tutorial classes and lectures for older people, are due to the recognition of our defects in this respect. Such movements require to be far more generally supported and made a normal and central part of Christian work. Only so shall we break the circle and train parents who can give a religious influence to their children.

It is as the fellowship of the congregation and the Church is made more vital and given fuller expression that this task of adult education will develop. We have seen that teaching is not solely a matter of instruction, and, as individuals are attracted into the service of a society which is actively engaged in Christlike efforts, in worship, in social reform, in missionary

enterprise, they will find their religious life growing larger, deeper, and more fruitful. Every attempt to enable the Church to discharge its function as the Body or instrument of Christ will of itself have educational value. As we recover reality in our services, as we face in Christ's Spirit and overcome by Christ's methods the evil of our personal and corporate life, as we explore new avenues for the extension of His Kingdom, we shall receive the best kind of Christian education.

Yet, because it is our mental growth that has been most neglected in the past, it is this aspect of adult education that should receive the closest attention. Nothing is, indeed, more obvious than the cleavage, both in the Church as a whole and in separate congregations and even households, between those who have stayed set in old ways of thinking and those who have accepted new knowledge and the outlook of to-day. The former are too

often at the mercy of heresies like Russellism, or the curious cult of the British Israelites; the latter, if liable at first to pass through a period of critical and mainly destructive Modernism, emerge into a secure, wide, and living faith, which, because intellectually tested, is not liable to be easily terrified or overthrown. The revival of the past twenty years among students and in the universities is almost entirely due to the interest created by modern methods of Bible study and by the effort to think out problems of science, of industry, and of politics in the light of a reasonable Christianity. A fearless attempt to use the new knowledge constructively attracts the support and renews the vitality of men and women otherwise repelled from religion, and proves itself a potent instrument, not only in the building up of a congregation, but for aggressive evangelism.

In the existing organisation of the

churches there is already ample scope for such educational work. If the old-fashioned exegetical sermon has fallen into disfavour, a type of preaching which expounds biblical events with a view to applying their lessons to modern conditions can be stimulating and productive. Exhortation also should not be merely emotional: otherwise its effect is liable to be transient. Every sermon should contain food for thought; and, if fresh ideas are put forward constructively and not negatively, even the most old-fashioned will welcome them. Clergy and ministers have been far too afraid of "shocking" their hearers, and often deliberately conceal their own vision of truth for fear of a hypothetical "weaker brother"—who is in reality often secretly hankering after the very enlightenment and help which is refused him. "Speaking the truth in love" is our duty; a cowardly silence is morally as bad as a wanton desire to wound the feelings.

Hesitation about dealing with controversial matters in the pulpit (which is the excuse for much vapid and irrelevant preaching) may, indeed, be due to the legitimate feeling that those who differ from the preacher have no means of replying, and that unless there can be discussion a pronouncement is of little worth. It is obvious that from the educational point of view an address or lecture which cannot be followed up is gravely handicapped. Where the main purpose of the sermon is to teach, or where ideas that may be unfamiliar are introduced, an opportunity either in an after-meeting or during the week for its discussion is almost a necessity. Arrangements for this can easily be made and it will be found quite invaluable in promoting real intellectual keenness, in helping the preacher to understand the difficulties of his people, and in creating the right sort of fellowship. A congregation ought not to accept the *ipse dixit* of their

minister as final ; and if he is wise he has no business to allow them to do so. The notion that he is there in order to declare to them the revealed will of God, which they are to receive without question, means in practice that they will listen to him just as long as he says what they wish to hear. At best it is not educative ; at worst it is a prostitution of truth to expediency.

Such discussions should be supplemented by meetings for group-study, either of the New Testament or of the application of Christianity to the problems of modern thought and life. The technique of the study-circle has been very fully explored, and is familiar to large numbers of church-people. The circle must not be regarded as a Bible-class or as an excuse for a lecture ; its leader must be a master of reticence, and quick to encourage all its members to take part ; whether a book is taken and discussed or the proceedings open with a paper or statement, the chief object is to

foster natural and frank expressions of opinion, that people may learn the interest of religion and feel at home in sharing their views and experiences. With this in mind it is often wise for the minister not to be a member of the circle except on special occasions, by invitation; for it is still a regrettable fact that his presence is apt to stifle debate, even if he himself resists the temptation to talk too much. If a circle can include a few members who do not belong to the Church, their presence will be of great value; one or two sincere unbelievers, or failing them someone who can act as *advocatus diaboli*, will immensely add to the reality and educational worth of the meetings. It should be remembered that those who are easily shocked are usually the victims of repressed anxieties, and that opinions genuinely held always deserve sympathetic consideration.

In many places there is real need for

lectures by recognised experts in doctrinal or applied theology where knowledge outside that of the ordinary Christian can be made available. At a time of rapid transition, and especially when, as at present, there is much lee-way to be made up, efforts of this kind are almost essential. Unfortunately, the number of experts is not large, and not all of them are capable of addressing an untrained audience; but the Church, if it set itself to mobilise its resources and make full use of them, could develop a great educational movement in this way. Many laymen and women could render service by bringing their own special subjects before their fellows. Use can often be made of popular courses provided by the extra-mural departments of universities or the various bodies interested in adult education. But the churches in a given area ought to combine to meet the need, pool their resources, and organise a graded scheme of tuition. In the vast

majority of subjects profitable for such a scheme denominational issues are not involved. Even if they are, the objection to their treatment by a lecturer from another body is hardly valid in an adult audience. Indeed, there is much to be said for making our people acquainted at first-hand with opinions that they do not ordinarily hear.

Finally, the effort to arouse and sustain intelligent interest in religion should be a primary part of the minister's pastoral work. If his church does not possess a lending library, he should be willing to use his own books as a substitute and to obtain copies of suitable literature for his people. In most countries there has recently been a large output of reasonably cheap books and pamphlets—some, it is true, of a merely propagandist and non-educative kind, but others excellently suited to the needs of modern, but untaught, believers. These books it is the business of the minister to know and recommend and he

should take advantage of his visiting to encourage their use. At special times, for the newly married, at the birth or christening of a child, when the child goes first to school, or in seasons of bereavement, he will usually find a desire for further understanding of the spiritual side of life, a deepened sense of obligation and a willingness for study. These should be opportunities for reviving or advancing religious education, either by suggesting lines of reading or by attaching those who are ready for it to circles or lecture-classes. Young mothers especially should have special help offered to them for meeting; and this a minister visiting his people should strive to arrange. Too often he simply gives a general exhortation to "come to church," and there provides something wholly inappropriate.

Something more should be said about the subjects suitable for adult education. In many cases this will be concerned

with matters neglected or misunderstood in youth, with the correcting of wrong ideas about the Old Testament, with the facts of the life of Jesus, with simple outlines of Christian doctrine and ethics. Even so, it should be remembered that the circumstances and experience of older people render a juvenile treatment unsuitable. They have seen more of life ; have learned the lessons that love and parenthood, struggle and suffering and the presence of death, can alone teach. Aspects of the work of Christ which no child can appreciate will now be the most precious part of His revelation. To the child, as to the early Christians of Greek blood, the Cross will normally seem difficult ; for there is as yet little knowledge of the power of sin and little insight into the meaning of suffering. Similarly, the enormously complicated issues which arise out of the conflict of loyalties though present in school-days are hardly then understood ; the

distinction between God and Mammon is usually clear cut, and the child knows on which side it ought to stand. Later on a decision is often almost intolerably hard to make, when loyalty to country or kin, obligations to dependents, duty to shareholders or customers, clash with desire to follow what otherwise seems a plainly Christian line of action. As a schoolboy John Smith may find his calling as a child of God difficult, or even painful; for he is weak and often self-betrayed. As a father, as an employer or employee, as a householder and a citizen, he becomes partaker in other men's sins, and has to face situations in which the arguments for this or that decision seem almost equally strong and equally open to objection; he is perplexed, not only by his own weakness, but by the complexity of the issue, and needs all the help that religion can give him if he is to decide fairly, intelligently, and in the interest of the highest.

There will thus be need to carry on into the environment of adult life the same themes which occupied the second phase in the teaching of Jesus—a fuller exploration of the revealed nature and purpose of God, and a closer appreciation of what God's will involves in the conduct of daily life. The whole Church needs far more general and far more enlightened study of both aspects of its faith, and in every congregation efforts should be made to focus attention upon them.

At the same time it must not be forgotten that, as life becomes more complex and full of stress, the " glad tidings of great joy " will be richer in encouragement and hope. There is a real danger in allowing ourselves to lay such emphasis on the efforts and problems of discipleship as to forget its resources and lose the childlike gaiety and creativeness of the believer. It is significant that it was precisely in the periods of peril, when Christianity demanded

sacrifice and martyrdom, that the fruit of the Spirit was most richly borne; it is in the catacombs that the eternal mirth and delight of the faith have their supreme expression. We must be careful that our adult education does not become drab and middle-aged, that it sustains ardour and fellowship and cheerfulness of conviction, that while our experience teaches us "how very hard it is to be a Christian," we may yet welcome life's roughness calmly and with confidence. We have so long regarded "taking up our Cross" as at best a dismal and daunting business, that it is not easy to contemplate it with a smile, or to thank God sincerely and happily for it. Our education must constantly seek to promote that "joy in believing" which comes only to those who have counted the cost and know that it is abundantly worth while; that, indeed, the paying of it is the one abiding satisfaction. When love has cast out fear there is no more room for depression or dismay.

It is plain that if religion is for us a process of education, and if we are not only to revise existing methods in our schools and colleges but to equip the Church to be itself and always a teaching body, a great change in the outlook and training of church members, and particularly of the ministry, is essential. In spite of the work of psychologists, educationalists, and Christian thinkers, in spite of the admitted failure and the apparent and universal need, in spite of the example of Jesus and the contrast between His methods and our own, there are still many, very many, Christian ministers to whom the whole premises of the Jerusalem Council, or of this book, are unfamiliar. They recognise that their calling demands, not only consecration of life, but a mass of specialised knowledge and of particular talents; but they have not usually included the study of the aims and technique of education as essential. Yet if their

primary task is the " cure of souls," this is clearly a work that demands educational skill. They must understand the conditions of healthy growth that they may deal with cases in which it is arrested or distorted; they must be wise teachers to diagnose and correct error and to train the patient into habits of development; they must be themselves learners at the feet of Him who was called the Teacher that they may bring others to discipleship and show them how to advance towards perfection. Nothing is, in fact, more important than a ripe understanding both of the content and of the method of religious education, since all their life's work, whatever its sphere, is, or should be, educative. Yet hitherto no systematic attempt has been made by the Church as a whole—or even by particular denominations, save in isolated cases—to give adequate tuition in this essential subject to candidates for the ministry or to maintain the interest in it

of those already commissioned. Hence comes the acquiescence in results which have long been recognised as grievously disappointing; hence, too, the failure to take advantage of a position which is, in reality, full of promise. It is not too much to say that if the Church would concentrate its attention upon the findings of scientific educationists, would realise the opportunity afforded by them, would equip its ministry with knowledge of the subject, a change of overwhelming magnitude might be effected in a single generation. It is admitted that education without religion is inevitably frustrated; it can be shown that Christianity is the religion that can alone supply what educators demand; if this were done, it is hard to believe that statesmen, teachers, and the general public would refuse to recognise its importance or to insist upon its place in every educational system. Indeed, if the wider conceptions of education and of religion for

which we are pleading were accepted, the function of the State and of the Church in this matter would be found to be identical. Each would wish for its members fullness of life; each would realise the conditions under which that wish can be fulfilled; both could co-operate unreservedly in what is thus a common task.

Till that day comes it should be the paramount duty of Christians to make full and wise use of the modern concept of education and of modern technique in teaching, and by so doing vindicate their claim to be followers of Jesus Christ, the "Teacher sent from God."

DATE DUE

BV 1471 .R293 1928 ,369
Raven, Charles Earl, 1885-
Christ and modern education

BONEBRAKE SEMINARY LIBRARY

United Theological Seminary Library
MAIN BV1471.R293 1928
Raven, Charle Christ and modern educatio
3 0645 0006 0162 1